The Cause and Cure of Industrial Unrest

By
E. B. FISH

Copyrighted, 1920, by
THE LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL JOURNAL CO.

British and translation rights reserved.

Published by
THE LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL JOURNAL CO.
4084-5 Arcade Building
Seattle, Wash.

Copyrighted, 1920, by
THE LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL JOURNAL CO.

British and translation rights reserved.

Published by
THE LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL JOURNAL CO.
4084-5 Arcade Building
Seattle, Wash.

The Cause and Cure
of
Industrial Unrest

E. B. FISH

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON
1920

HD8012
F46

E. B. FISH

FOREWORD

During twenty years as a journalist in close connection with the Labor Movement I have had occasion to peruse many volumes which could rightly be considered under the above caption. But none of these volumes went to the heart of the matter. They were professional, pedagogic, or merely echoes of European Socialism with its incompatability of temperament for Americans.

The work of E. B. Fish, however, is a revelation. It comes glowing hot from the anvils of a worker's struggles. It beats out the metal of Resentment to Wrong and undemocratic methods in workingmen and employers. Its sparks of inspiration fly from the hammer of individual experience. And its American sentiment, once placed in action, will go far to heal our unrest.

The chapters which deal with THE CAUSE are a veritable education in present and chronic discontent.

The Employer who reads them sincerely will get

a clear vision of the disruptive forces at work among the toilers; and the worker will find sympathetic rendering of the suppression he has met equally at the hands of tyrannical bosses and the all-powerful Union officials.

The democratic principles laid down in The Cure are built on the needs of the heart and follow the infallible experience of men who have succeeded in solving these everyday problems in an American way along identical lines.

The whole forms a human document with the first lines written at the machines during the war in the Sumner Iron Works, Everett, followed up while on a speaking tour among the lumber camps of the Northwest and brought to a close in the office of the Labor and Industrial Journal.

It creates the impression of an ardent battler for the Right imbued with a vision of American Democracy applied to our Industrial Unrest. A vision which will carry the seer far up the paths of Reconstruction to pinnacles of American manhood administering the principles of our Constitution in The Industrial Democracy of tomorrow.

HERBERT FORDER.

THE CAUSE AND CURE OF INDUSTRIAL UNREST

CHAPTER I.

The cause and cure of industrial unrest is a subject dealing with one of the most important of human relationships. The relationship of employe to employer. In a more restricted sense, of capital and labor.

The whole discussion must be raised at once from the low level of an impersonal heartless thing called capital and its relationship to a more or less impersonal and heartless machine called labor. Therefore, we say, this phase of the subject, capital and labor, enters into our discussion in a restricted sense only.

Capital is the means men (human beings) use to further certain plans and projects. Labor is what certain other men (human beings) furnish to further certain plans and projects. These human beings have a mutuality of interests. The success and prosperity of one spells the success and prosperity of the other.

If one element fails in this great combine, for instance the employer, the employee suffers. If, on the other hand, the employee is unhappy, discontented and rebellious, the employer faces loss, if not failure. Now, because those furnishing the means and direction of industry are human beings, "mere folks," and those furnishing the skill and energy and labor, upon which industry is built are "mere folks," and because these humans have a mutuality of interests, and because their combined enterprise furnishes the very sinews of prosperity, in fact, advances or jeopardizes the very existence of our civilization, it follows that any discussion offered in contribution to an amicable, satisfactory and fair adjustment of that relationship is of vital moment.

If an intelligent being from Mars should suddenly find himself on our planet and in the United States of America, and possessed of no knowledge of the basic principles, or primary declarations of our national life, he would be immediately impressed that America was divided into two great hostile camps. If, in addition, he should be unfortunate enough to drop into a meeting of radical employers or a gathering of disturbed and rebellious workers, and if, after a little further acquaintance, he should learn the great motto of our national unity, "**E Pluribus Unum,**" he would be affrighted at our condition, and would most surely

predict our utter and speedy ruination as a great people.

As we see it, his opinions would not be far astray. Verily a crisis confronts us. A world atmosphere of revolution surrounds us. The black clouds of gathering storms approach. The sullen mutter of the angry elements, even now, are heard. Athwart the sky of America's national existence, shoots the forked flame of uncontrolled human hate and passion, while following in the wake of the furious blast, the black vultures of anarchy and hell wait to feed upon the carcass of what was once proud, successful and hopeful America.

"Alarmist!" you cry. Yes, if you will, but in the same sense that watchers at the wrecked bridge make frantic efforts to stop the mad rush of the oncoming express. In the same sense as "alarmists" at Johnstown sought to give warning of the swiftly approaching and fearful flood. Would to God we had the speed and trumpet of the Arch Angel; we would blow a blast from Maine to California, from our northern boundary to the Gulf of Mexico, which would alarm, arouse and awaken this country to see the lurid blasts from hell which approach and which carry on their fiery pinions the elements which mean wreck, devastation and death, and thus save by

"alarming," if you please, our land from the fury of the storm.

We add our voice to a multitude of others who see and realize the grave outlook. Hopeless? No; we believe America holds within herself the magic of speedy and permanent safety.

If we were to pass a criticism on our national temper, it would be that we lack the balance necessary to true perspective. We fly to extremes. We blow hot and cold. We cry aloud at the approaching crisis (and our people can face it as bravely as any), only to sink back again into blissful indifference, because of momentary adjustment. Today a coal strike paralyzes industry, causes untold suffering and misery, tomorrow it is settled for the moment and we are satisfied. It matters not if the very settlement carry seeds of further and greater trouble. Oh that we could learn the tenacity, energy and blind faith of revolutionary mania. Oh, that we could learn that sowing seeds of injustice to the wind is sure to bring the reaping time of whirlwind. In a word, if we could only learn that the great problem of industrial relationship is not settled until it is settled once and for all; that seeming settlements, appearances, do not suffice; that the problem must be threshed out from, and on, the very foundations of our government; that we must come out of the bogs

of dollars and cents, hours and working conditions, to the sunlit summits of American Brotherhood. Then, and then only, man to man, in an atmosphere from which the fog of suspicion and anarchy has been dispelled by the favoring breath of patriotic kindness and sympathy, we may look into each other's faces and own kinship in the great family of free people.

CHAPTER II.

We have endeavored to indicate in our introductory chapter the plane upon which we wish to discuss this momentous subject. Would that with one stroke we could bring the multitude to understand, that all the cures offered for our industrial and social ills, the curative principles of which are not founded upon a proper understanding of the parties involved are the cheapest kind of quackery.

We must insist that capital on the one hand and labor on the other, considered as mere machines, do not furnish the proper basis for discussion and settlement. What is behind capital? What is behind labor, which is organized and sold in lump by labor leaders on the basis of highest concession? The answer indicates the true place of consideration, and any school boy can furnish it. Behind capital is intelligent directing and (would that we could honestly say, in every instance) sympathetic, human personality. On the other hand, labor is furnished by intelligent, active men and women.

We are going to risk the criticism of sameness and repetition to drive home the thought that we are not

dealing in any primary sense with a machine nor a commodity. Because, in so far as money is the sole object and purpose of organization on the part of any man, he becomes sordid and his machine a heartless monster incapable of sympathetic touch and bent on sweeping into the maw of its greed, even the helpless and weak. Some may resent this statement but we propose to put the knife into the sore and that without fear or favor. Our humble heart has gone out in sympathy on more than one occasion towards certain heads of big business who were, personally, the finest kind of men, but who were, nevertheless, being most woefully misrepresented by a soulless inhuman machine of their own creation, the sole purpose of which was the making of money.

These observations apply with equal pertinency, though from a different angle, to the other side. Workers, to protect themselves, have banded together in various organizations, and these have reached a place of power, so great that American toilers dominated by red autocrats, have been led to the very brink of ruin. We are not opposed to organization, but there is a third party interested in this struggle, one who has gone through untold suffering, and who now begins to speak, and upon whose attitude and decisions in the final analysis, all depends. Meet then, my friends, (captains of in-

dustry and leaders of labor), our erstwhile silent, suffering but now relentless critic and friend, "the public." He announces the opinions of the consumers, the unorganized business and working man. He says "Organize if you will, but please remember that America is not going to be organized to death, and that from now on, we are going to insist that, like the crimson thread which runs through the cordage of the British Navy, there shall run throughout the various ramifications of your respective organizations the red blood of humanity and freedom."

No matter how it may run counter to our notions, we are never going to reach a satisfactory solution of the industrial puzzle until we accept the position which is so perfectly obvious that it needs no argument to sustain it; that industry rests, as to stability and development, upon the shoulders, hearts and minds of **men** and the industrial relation is a relationship, not of machine to machine, but of man to man. Then, when we further consider, that involved in this there is the further relationship of the public with is multiplied thousands of helpless men, women and children and that above all is the relationship of this combined mass of feeling, thinking, active, human beings to the traditions, laws, and customs of America, we have a problem of tremendous scope, and one

which at first appears hopelessly intricate; but let the parties concerned once break through the confusion and suspicion which now separates them, and look each other in the eyes like American free men, and recognize that they are human brothers with common sorrows, joys and aspirations, and the battle is half won, for we are on the common ground of settlement.

CHAPTER III.

Having once settled in our minds what is an all-too-often forgotten, yet perfectly evident fact that, the industrial stability and enterprise of the country depends upon the satisfactory relationship of man to man, instead of machine to machine, we proceed to analyze the cause of the great unrest which is disturbing our land and which is bound to obtain unless we grasp a thorough understanding of certain basic facts upon which we must work out a settlement of our troubles.

First, then, we set it down as a general proposition to be proved by subsequent discussion, that the underlying cause of unrest is due to a failure to comply with, or a departure from, certain simple American principles which we, as citizens, once took great pride in adhering to in our relations one with another. Many will not accept this simple statement, for the very plain and quite sufficient reason that their whole philosophy of industrial relations is founded upon a false premise. They argue thus: "Here is my employer representing hundreds of thousands of invested capital, making money hand

over fist, and here am I with absolutely nothing but my labor power to sell, and having a difficult time to drag out a miserable existence. What two propositions could be farther apart than our interests?''

Before examining this position, suffer us to state that we have purposely set the case in as strong a light as possible. The statement that the employer ''is making money hand over fist'' is incapable of general application. Frequently he faces actual loss and plunges into ruin. Likewise the employe is not generally speaking dragging out a miserable existence—more frequently he is comfortable and getting along prosperously.

The idea that so-called capital and labor have no common interests, and that there can be no satisfactory compromise or understanding between them, is one of the main contentions of the I. W. W., and this teaching has entered the minds of untold thousands of workers, who do not carry a Red card and would fight in an instant were they called ''wobbly,'' and it would appear at first sight that the same pernicious notion has entered into the thinking of some employers, and when once this erroneous position is accepted, the inexorable logic of the thing forces both employer and employe to the inevitable and destructive conclusion that, because they haven't anything in common, they must take steps to protect their sepa-

rate interests. Result—organization, not for co-operation, but for warfare and clash of interests.

We readily admit what no one but a fool would deny, that reasons have existed on both sides for flight to organization to save the situation from intolerable industrial autocracy on the one hand, or of radical and unreasonable labor demands on the other. But, nevertheless, here are two organizations, founded upon the false supposition that the employe has no concern for the well-being or success of the employer, and vice-versa. That each is trying to get all possible out of the other and give as little as possible in return.

Now, as these two supposedly opposing elements increase in organized strength, strife, suspicion and antagonism gather power and it does not take a philosopher to see that no industrial situation can be peaceful and satisfactory where such organized antagonism exists.

Observe first, the employer and employe are organized away from each other, whereas the purpose of organization should be to bring them closer together. Second, as they get farther apart, it becomes increasingly easy for misunderstanding and suspicions to exist and develop, and where such conditions exist there can be no candid and open discussion, and where open discussion is impossible, co-op-

eration and conciliation flee and confusion worse confounded reigns. Third, they get into widely separated camps, where demagogues and radical leaders make capital of their confusion and they become easy prey to any kind of loud-mouthed, fly-by-night schemes. Fourth, that most vital and altogether essential thing which we call human touch, is lost; henceforth they are enemies, torn by jealousy and strife and watching each other's every movement like beasts of the jungle. From this situation arise ten thousand different conditions and symptoms which certain kinds of leaders and hot-air artists seize upon and point to as cause, which in fact are merely effects.

But here we have as plain a departure from simple, yet all-important American priciple as could be well imagined. We have forgotten that the American citizen, who works with his hands for a livelihood, is a man—a human being. We have been looking and dealing with him as a cog in a machine, and a member of a militant labor organization which is bent on cramping and hindering our activities and success. No marvel, for employers have certainly had reason to view labor in that light. We have forgotten also that the American employer is likewise a man, a mere human being. A man subject to like passions as we are. That he has problems under

which many of us would collapse and fail. That he covets and appreciates sympathetic co-operation, and that he wishes and works for our good, the while he seeks to advance his own fortune. That he takes great financial risks—works long hours to make his venture a success, and we who should prosper as he succeeds, all too often appear ready to throw a monkey-wrench into the machinery.

To be sure, some one will ask, "Are all employers thus minded?" No, but all genuinely American employers are. For Americanism is a spiritual thing, a virtue akin to loyalty to one's God, and the man actuated by its spirit, be he poor or rich, believes in a certain fundamental equality which spells "my brother's keeper," and whether you like it or not, remember it was a murderous Cain who slew his brother—who first tried to shift that great but pleasant responsibility.

Honesty demands we admit that if blame is to be fixed for first departure from the simple principle of American brotherhood in industry it would rest largely at the door of certain kinds of industrial autocrats. More heartless, inhuman Czars never lived than some heads of big enterprises, who have scattered the seeds of injustice to the winds, and employers of our day, many of them just and honorable, are reaping the harvest. If we must have an

autocracy in the United States, let us build one founded upon the accident of birth rather than upon the sordid foundation of wealth. If that is not satisfactory, and we must have autocracy in the United States, give us that founded upon wealth, as much as we hate it, in preference to that based upon the brute force of numbers and more times than not led by the ignorant, such as the Bolshevist and I. W. W. Yes, we have these industrial and labor czars with us today, but remember public opinion is a colossus that will surely pull these little potentates from their shaky thrones and bump their heads together until they see the stars of American democracy everywhere in the firmament of their activities.

This country we tell you again is America, and we are not going to have any kind of autocratic minorities or personalities bossing this country.

That the necessity for understanding on the basis of the principle for which we contend is being generally recognized, we have great reason to believe; signs are favorable and are multiplying. We were much impressed recently by a remark made by an employer of large calibre: "Possibly we are somewhat to blame for the situation, but after a while they (employes) will realize that we are just common human beings." The same feeling was expressed in somewhat different language by an hon-

est, but outspoken longshoreman at the conclusion of a meeting we were holding in Seattle on the water-front recently, with a great preamble of cuss words he said: "Don't they (the employers) know we are also human beings?"

There you have it. We all come from different stratas of America's social life—this must needs be, for we run together socially, according to our affinities, tastes and qualifications, but after all, we are all members of a common family, and there is no relation in all our multiform life where this needs greater emphasis and recognition than in American industry.

Some small mentality is going to object that our modern industrial life is too intricate and complex to adopt such principles. We are going to discuss this in a later chapter, but for the present we want to refer you to George F. Johnson's labor creed, "A great industrial establishment should, as closely as possible, follow the old idea of small business, in which the master had his shop and his house adjoining, and he and his workers and apprentices lived, as well as worked, together." This is taken from an article in the current issue of "System" entitled, "Thirty Years Without a Strike." We do not recommend Mr. Johnson's practices, but from this setting of plain words a jewel of principle sparkles, viz.: that of fellowship—humanity and brotherhood.

This we most seriously recommend to any one who employs or who toils. No wonder he could say, "We have been in business for thirty years without a strike—have risen from a few hundred to more than thirteen thousand men—and have increased our annual sales from less than $600,000 a year to $75,000,000."

It was the active presence of this human touch of brotherhood in a square-toed American employer which saved this writer from utter and irreparable ruin, and the absence of it in American industry has more to do with the existing confusion and the necessity which rests upon us as workers today of breaking down the power of an autocratic labor machine, than any other one thing.

CHAPTER IV.

In our last chapter attention was called to the fact that the workers, and a considerable number of employers, were engaged in organizing to protect their so-called separate interests. We pointed out also that all industrial organizations not founded upon the idea that the interests of employer and employe are identical, were wrong. In other words, organization must be for co-operation instead of combat. We indicated our belief also that much of the present day organization was tearing us away from certain fundamental American principles, especially the recognition of common membership in a great family of free people, and the American doctrine of co-operation in industry.

In this chapter we wish to further pursue this thought in its relation to the spirit and activities of the present day labor movement. We are going to say some plain things. Therefore, we feel it incumbent upon us to acknowledge the good which union labor has accomplished, and, under certain conditions, might still accomplish. But most surely not in the way it has been directed and in the spirit it

has manifested during the last few years. On the other hand we hold that when industry is sufficiently Americanized, union labor as we now know it, will quietly pass away.

But to resume, much is being said at present about the disloyalty of labor. We have always maintained, however, that labor as a whole is patriotic and loyal, and yet we are confronted with the outstanding fact, that the I. W. W. and kindred radical movements have not only shot the ranks of labor through and through with un-American spirit, but that in many localities, radical elements entirely dominate and speak for union labor. It is no secret, for instance, that the leader of one of the greatest strikes in our history—the steel strike—could not entirely clear himself from the charge of active, revolutionary sympathy. The strike has been lost—mainly as a result of this leadership.

One is led to inquire "why is it that foreign, un-American theories of government have taken root so quickly in our unions and the labor movement has apparently lent itself so readily to extreme and radical notions? Some one is going to object, "the writer is forgetting the loyalty of labor during the war." Oh! no! not at all! neither is he forgetting that many unions went on strike for bigger wages, shorter hours, double time for overtime, and what-not, dur-

ing the same war, and this while American boys were jeopardizing their lives in the disease-breeding trenches of the Old World—working day and night for thirty dollars a month—constantly in danger of actual annihilation for need of some of the very things their striking brothers could have produced for them. Yes, we hear the old argumentative question "What were the capitalists doing during the war? They made untold-millions, etc., etc." Granted, some of them were far from being good Americans, but as an argument, this is the merest "bunk" and does not in any sense constitute a justification for any of labor's disloyal acts. Two wrongs never make a right. Let us admit that some employers were greedy and took advantage of conditions to amass great fortunes, though God alone knows how the country could have been saved had it not been for the money, the brains and the active participation of America's industrial leaders in the prosecution of the war. But is labor guiltless in this respect (taking advantage of war conditions to further its own ends) did we not profit by the war? Did not certain elements in labor as much as say "Now is our chance, they need us—we will fix them—this is our day, come through?" And did not labor, in the main, roll in prosperity? Mere boys made wages which would in prewar times have staggered the most

seasoned and experienced skilled men. "The high cost of living?" Yes. On the other hand workers bought automobiles, diamonds, sealskin coats, silk shirts, etc. Sure, workers are entitled to the best possible, but let us not deny that union labor took great advantage of war conditions to further its own aims and seat itself firmly as a dictator in industrial affairs, and when their demands were not immediately met, strikes and walk-outs occurred. Have we forgotten so soon that the Government had to threaten? Think of it—threaten American working men, with service on the firing line, to get sufficient workers. "Work or Fight" sent more than one fellow to a he-man's job during the war.

Were the employers wrong? You say they were. We hold no brief for them. But they didn't strike—they didn't lay off—and many of America's leading men worked for your Uncle Sam for a dollar a year, while others turned their plants over to government work and some suffered great loss. Let us admit they were all you say they were, a bunch of greedy, grasping, un-American capitalists. But what then? Does that justify labor? "But labor did all the working and all the fighting and the rich men used their money to buy sons and themselves out of the army." Of course, labor wasn't guilty of claiming industrial exemption and securing it too, and using

it to strike on the job, hiding behind steel plates fifteen or twenty minutes before the whistle blew, and agitating strikes and walkouts. Those who live in glass houses must not throw stones. And just what is meant by union labor doing all the working and all the fighting? The sons of some of America's most prominent men volunteered for service and many of them paid the great price, and while it is true that the American army was made up to a large extent of working men and working men's sons, that indicates nothing more than that we working men are in the majority, and we must remember too that the majority of American toilers are not organized. Therefore, this wild claim of union labor is the merest nonsense. Surely, labor suffered greatly, but there is many an employer in America who would give all his gold to have once more at his side the son he loved and has lost awhile.

It gets really tiresome to hear this continual prattle about labor's patriotism during the war. Let us gladly and thankfully admit that the great majority of America's toilers were and are patriotic. Honesty also demands that we admit that many of them were poorly led, and we are going to acknowledge further, because it indicates the anemic condition into which America has fallen, that this country was not so feverishly patriotic that there was any

danger of our fulfilling Mr. Bryan's famous prophecy "a million men will spring to arms over night." In addition, we are going to recall that while our brave boys were dying in France to save democratic institutions, certain agitators were going over the country inciting to rebellion against the Draft Law, and making frantic endeavors to break the morale of the people at home by denominating the war a capitalistic fight. We also recollect that after these same agitators were arrested and jailed for their devilish actions, strikes, revolutions and other extreme measures were threatened unless they were released.

Does any fellow worker resent this arraignment? We cannot blame him, but it is true nevertheless and the only way for labor to clear itself is to dump the radicals, incendiaries, and anarchists overboard and do it quickly. It is much more pleasant to think we all willingly did our bit to whip Kaiser Bill, and this writer has a disposition to forget and leave it there. But when the wily agitator wants to camouflage his attack or cover his retreat, he throws out a great barrage of talk about the patriotism of union labor during the war. Then we look backward and what we find there is not always pleasant. Two things, however, we invariably find: First, that wherever labor was standing loyally by the government (and

thank heaven it could be found from coast to coast and north to south), no credit is due the low-browed, bomb-throwing, torch-bearing, windjamming agitator. On the other hand, wherever you find labor astray during the war period and still more today, it is due to the influence of these same undesirable gentry.

Union men of America, you are not only big and brave enough to throw off the tyranny of the Red Autocrats, but you are wise enough to break through the barriers and formulas of yesterday and swing out into freedom of a greater, more prosperous, democratic and industrial tomorrow.

The ordinary American employer is at the present moment from five to ten years in advance of most labor agitators. No more auspicious occasion ever appeared than the present hour to Americanize and democratize industry. But it can never be accomplished while men are organizing for strife, the protection of inefficiency and the building of a nonsensical labor autocracy.

CHAPTER V.

The cause of industrial unrest we have attributed to un-American attitudes and policies by employers and employees.

In our last chapter we dealt with the question of the loyalty of organized labor during the war. While this was in some respects a digression from the main line of discussion, it was necessary nevertheless, in order to answer the agitator who sought to justify present disloyal and disruptive activities by throwing into the teeth of his challengers the much vaunted loyalty of labor during the period of national crisis.

The question projected for answer in the last chapter "Why has union labor lent itself so readily to the leadership of radicalism?" remains to be answered in this and succeeding chapters.

It must be remembered that we bring no charges of disloyalty against labor as a whole nor against the great leaders of the movement who have been tried and tested in the anxious days of crisis which came to us all during the war. If labor or its generally esteemed leaders have been betrayed into un-

patriotic stands, it is due largely to the usurpation of leadership by radicals, which in the main has been accomplished because the rank and file have lacked that good old-fashioned American back-bone which has made us great as a people.

This book, however, proposes to deal with foundation principles, for it is there, and there only, that we shall find a satisfactory answer to our problems.

To say that radicals on the one hand, and spineless union men on the other, are to blame to a great extent for present conditions, is true. But this does not answer the fundamental question. Strong, patriotic, union leadership, backed by obedience on the part of the rank and file, has just saved the miners from a disaster which threatened to wreck their union.

This same leadership and obedience may assure a fairer approximation to perfect functioning for the present—and still, the machine itself, may become again in the near future a serious menace to our peace and safety. Your automobile may break down on the road forty miles from home. Skill in patch work and operating may bring you in, and even carry you about your business and pleasure for a time, but you are in danger of walking, or worse, at any time, until the machine is thoroughly overhauled and properly fixed.

So with any industrial organization either of labor or employer. If it is wrong and un-American at bottom it will take very strong leadership and loyalty to hold it even partially in line, and it will be ever ready to run amuck and lend itself to practices antagonistic to our institutions.

Here is the case in a nutshell and without further parley or mincing of words: Labor organizations as represented by unions along craft lines are fundamentally un-American. Let any man deny this who can. It is not a question of the stalwart patriotism of Samuel Gompers, John Lewis or any other leader or their followers. The question lies deeper than this. It is not a question of the improper and unpatriotic, unbrotherly attributes of employers which has brought into being an apparent necessity for organized labor. We must go deeper than that.

Will any sane man deny that from the very beginning of our history, yes, away back when our fathers were a little company of persecuted Christians, we believed, practiced and preached co-operation? And has not adherence to this same wholesome principle made us what we are? And if we had clung to it tenaciously would we not be far and away beyond what we are today in all the arts and culture of civilization?

But this machine—Organized Labor—does not

stand for co-operation, all the leaders and members to the contrary notwithstanding. The employers' machine will be treated and operated upon in due time. The patient on the table at present is Union Labor. Let us stay the knife until we can properly and successfully finish this delicate job. Let the reader consult any history on the Labor War in the United States. It is one which teems with a story of conflict after conflict. Untold billions of dollars and thousands of human lives have been lost in Labor Wars within the confines of peaceful America. Why? Because union labor is an organization for combat. We are not overlooking the necessity, real or imaginary, for its existence. Let us not be side-tracked from our argument. Labor is organized today, and was organized in the beginning, to protect the interests of workers against the real, and fancied, autocratic encroachments of employers. These organizations were started with a wrong idea and both sides are still at fault. We have lived long enough to learn that capital, labor and brains must be happy and agreeable partners. Otherwise wreck and ruin ensue.

We readily admit that union labor has apparently gone wrong in recent years only. But this is merely in appearance. Certain practices and doctrines entirely un-American in origin and results have been

adhered to by organized workers from the beginning. Take a well known I. W. W. doctrine for instance, "Sabotage." John Spargo says that "during the whole period of modern industrialism there was never a time when discontented workers did not attempt to gain revenge for real, or fancied wrongs, by spoiling materials and tools, retarding production, etc. Nothing in these practices ever inspired men to construct elaborate theories about them, or to build policies upon them, until the strange Scotch colloquialism "Ca Canny" fascinated a little group of French intellectuals, and to translate it they coined a new word, "Sabotage," which in turn fascinated certain groups in this country. Commonplace trades, union policies and ideas were thus easily glorified by the mere substitution of French terms for English."

Note the doctrine and practice of Sabotage, which has been carried to such heights and depths of devilish perfection by Haywood and his crowd, is un-American in origin. It is older than the organization known as the I. W. W., and has been practiced, says Spargo, "during the whole period of modern industrialism" and is "A commonplace trade union policy."

Will anyone dare stand up and say that this is American? It is most emphatically un-American and destructive of prosperity for every element of our

population. And because it is un-American it is wrong. Wrong because, as we go back to the beginning of American history, we find our forefathers laid down the foundations of this government on the immutable principle of right, and in so far as we have departed from that principle which runs through the moral constitution of the universe, we have suffered confusion and defeat.

No matter by what method of sophistry men argue themselves into the belief that Sabotage is right and founded upon sound economic law, the fact remains that, just so long as the pillars of the universe stand just so long will right be right, and wrong be wrong. And the practice of wrong in any avenue of human action leads to ruination, individually and nationally. No man can read the pages of history written as they are with a pen dipped in human blood, punctuated by the flash of the saber and the screams of dying humanity, without being impressed with the fact that nations and dynasties have prospered or toppled into ruin in proportion as they have adhered to, or departed from, the principles of right and justice. And this holds in regard to organizations whether it be the Praetorian Guard or the American Federation of Labor.

CHAPTER VI.

Time and space forbid any detailed discussion of Sabotage.

For the benefit of those who doubt the contention that the practice has been carried on from the very beginnings of Trade Unionism, we refer you to any unbiased history of the labor movement.

We must carefully discriminate between the radicalism manifested by various labor organizations in recent years which has voiced sentiments, and manifested tendencies, not only radical as to labor demands, but positively destructive to Democratic institutions, and the other forms and tendencies inherent in the labor movement from the beginning.

The radicalism we call red-revolutionary, so much in evidence just now, has undoubtedly been caused by "boring from within."

The other aspect deals entirely with radical departures from co-operative principles (between employer and employee) and has laid the foundations, and furnished the inspiration for the present ultra-radical movements, which have carried certain doctrines to a considerable height of active perfection.

Sabotage belongs to this category. It has not only been practiced by them from the beginning, but is now being adhered to by many so-called conservative union men.

It can be observed in almost any shop in all its phases, from actual, wilful destruction of the employer's property, to slowing down on the job and curtailing production. Limiting production is destructive to the employer's interests as well as those of the workers, and comes, therefore, within the meaning of the word.

Can the reader imagine a successful revolution founded upon a practice so utterly and hopelessly dishonest as Sabotage, to say nothing of the old objection, which as yet remains unanswered—sabotage "destroys the worker's pride in his work." What of the worker's integrity, his sense of honor and fair play, his faith in himself and his fellows? Can a state built upon such conditions permanently succeed? It cannot. If it could come into being today it would be honeycombed with intrigue, conspiracy, distrust and discontent. Such is the answer of history and common sense. There isn't an agitator in the world with as many brains as God gave the geese—a teaspoonful to a thousand—but will admit in his secret heart that so-called class-solidarity could not be maintained under such conditions.

Labor today, from the bottom to the top, is one seething mass of turmoil, suspicion, charges and counter-charges. The leaders are accused by the rank and file, times out of number, of dishonesty and selling out to employers; there is mutual distrust and charges of scabbing by union men upon union men.

How could it be otherwise among men who will deliberately destroy the property of others, or curtail and limit their own productive powers, thus violating a simple agreement, which common honesty demands should be kept inviolate by the worker who sells his labor power for so much money per hour, day or month. Imagine a Government founded upon such hellish doctrines and controlled by people who believe in and practice them.

The present order of society is far from perfection. But with all its imperfections it is a veritable paradise compared to the proposed state erected upon the dishonesty of the proletariat.

At present we know our principles are righteous and calculated to insure the greatest amount of prosperity to our people possible, measured only by their brains, industry, and the break of luck which no government can effectually control. We seek to get back to them more and more, but the millennium, to which the bloody fingers of the revolutionist point, is one

of black foreboding, one in which the red demon sits on the throne of confusion. Virtue, confidence, justice, freedom and ambition are the bleeding and enchained captives of lust, distrust, dishonesty, tyranny and sloth. A millennium vomited out of hell, from which order has fled pursued by disorder, in whose gory hands are the torch and the bomb. A millennium from which the song of birds, the happy prattle of little children, the laughter of youth, the beauty and strength of mid life, the serenity and content of old age and the music and harmony of affable relationship are gone. A millennium from which the scream of hungry childhood, anguished and outraged womanhood, broken and prostrate manhood, shall ascend to the fire-swept heavens. While ruling all is the scepter of universal despair, and over all shall wave, in the hot blasts of hell, the red flags of anarchy. While the disharmony of red triumph shall be played by demons, damned and cast out, on flutes of flame and the tom toms of perdition.

For this we are asked to discharge the free governments of the earth, to exchange our order of society founded at least upon righteous principles. We are asked to exchange America, "The land of the free and the home of the brave," the land of laughter, song, sunshine and promise, to exchange our

starry banner with all its symbols, Humanity, Liberty and Equality. Shall we do it? Not as long as God reigns upon the throne of the Universe, and the sun marches in triumph across the blue dome of the sky, and the stars beam in the vaulted azure. As long as time endures—never. Come back, ye people of Columbia! Come back to the bed rock your fathers laid—of patriotic manhood. Swear once more undying allegiance to right and justice. Draw the flashing sabre of honest dealing and face your enemies in grim array. Victory is yours for the trial and the world will join in the jubilee.

What has been said of Sabotage, a weapon of syndicalism, in relation to Trade Unionism, can be as truthfully said with regard to the whole philosophy of Eugene Sorrell. "A new development of an old movement," says a great Labor Leader. The word "syndicalism" is in ordinary usage, the French equivalent of the English term "Trade Unionism." The word is not used, however, as a synonym for labor unionism as we know it. And yet the philosophy of syndicalism and Trade Unionism are so similar in certain phases, that one cannot escape the notion that Trade Unionism furnished at least, a beginning for the modern movement.

For instance, there is one note which vibrates throughout the propaganda of the extremists. It

declares itself to be concerned only with the interests of the proletariat. The wage-working classes. That the present order of society is ruled by the capitalistic class, and the workers are wage slaves upon whose back the exploiting class rides to riches, luxury and control. They state that there is a fundamental conflict between these classes which cannot be settled by compromise. One class or the other must be destroyed. Such statements as these open the way for any kind of lawlessness, and the insane and terrible doctrine that, any means to overthrow the capitalists is justified. Now, because law protects property rights, as well as principles of freedom, law must be destroyed. Thus Wm. D. Haywood in the "New York Call and Volkzeitung;" "I despise the law." "No true Socialist can be a law-abiding citizen." "When the worker comes to know the truth he will use any weapon to win his fight, therefore he does not hesitate to break the laws." "Under Socialism the Government will be an industrial Government, a shop Government.

It is obvious that this statement indicates the meaning of the movement and philosophy in full bloom. No man could imagine any of our great conservative labor leaders making a cold-blooded statement like Haywood's. Certainly not. And yet, what masterful leadership and unbending patriotism

it has taken on the part of conservative leaders, to hold their followers from doing the very things outlined by Haywood.

However, candor requires that we admit that the machine has gotten beyond control many times, and has even forced great leaders, about whose patriotism there can be no question, into utterances and actions which, to say the least, are open to very serious question.

But does organized labor, as represented by the American Federation of Labor, believe there are two antagonistic classes in America?

We shall see.

CHAPTER VII.

Industrial peace can never be permanently enjoyed while employers and employes believe they are members of separate classes, distinct and apart as to interest, possibilities and achievement. Even superficial students of industrial affairs must have recognized by this time that, the most fruitful cause of unrest is the constant insistence on class distinctions which is being carried on by extremists. When an artificial class-consciousness is built up and commits itself to the undemocratic assumption that the classes thus erected are antagonistic, trouble as inevitably follows as darkness follows daylight.

Are the Socialists, Bolshevists and I. W. W. alone responsible for the existence of the class war with its consequent hatreds and strife? They are not.

"Either by specific declaration or by implication, Union Labor accepts as a fact the division of modern industrial society into classes with antagonistic interests. Its existence is the result of a conviction that the employers as a class do not and cannot have the same interests as the wage-earners, and that the wage-earners must combine, in order that, by their

collective power they may wrest from the employers higher wages, shorter hours and improved conditions of labor. This philosophy is shared by the most conservative as well as by the most radical labor unionists. Apart from it labor unionism could have no raison d'etre.

"Either by specific declaration or by implication, too, all unions, whether radical or conservative, accept the view that the laborer is exploited; that the sum of rent, interest and profit is produced by the addition to natural resources of human labor (using that term as all the great economists do to include all forms of productive effort) and should belong to the laborer. The enjoyment of this sum by others is the result of a parasitic extortion which ought to be eliminated.

"Some of the unions make radical declarations of these principles in their membership pledges and constitutions. They declare that there is a fundamental conflict between the capitalists and the workers which can only end when the system of exploitation through the medium of wages is destroyed. Other unions may refuse to adopt such declarations of faith and even repudiate them, avowing their desire to be only "a fair day's wages for a fair day's work," and for harmonious relations with their employers. But in actual practice this theoretical mod-

eration is of little or no consequence. Ask any organizer belonging to such a union to justify the existence of his union, and he will at once begin to argue that the worker needs to protect himself against encroachments on his liberty or standard of living by the employer. Ask him why such a danger exists if the employers' interests are not contrary to the interests of the workers, in their special relations as employers and employees, and he will at once surrender his union's declared faith and fall back upon its real faith, which is rooted in the stern realities of class conflict.

"Ask such an organizer to define what is meant by 'a fair day's wage for a fair day's work,' to state the principle or principles by which it is to be determined, and he will be forced to admit that the phrase is really meaningless. What he really believes is that, the workers get as much as they can compel the employers to pay, and that they ought to struggle to make the employers pay more and more for less and less work, until the logical end is attained and nothing is taken from labor as rent, interest and profit."—John Spargo on "Syndicalism, Industrial Unionism and Socialism," chapter 1, page 4.

The whole labor union movement is founded then upon the belief that there are at least two great in-

dustrial classes antagonistic to each other. Examine the journals of labor. Is the doctrine of co-operation ever preached? Do not the writers and leaders plainly indicate by positive assertion, and by any other means necessary, their belief that employers are bent on the exploitation of labor?

Are not the weapons of the Reds the weapons of organized labor—not the bomb, the torch and open threat against Government perhaps (and yet violence is nothing new in labor warfare), but sabotage, boycott and the strike? If the Socialists and I. W. W.'s have found certain principles and weapons at hand and they have developed and carried them farther than patriotic union men care to follow, is organized labor going to succeed in "passing the buck" entirely to the radicals, incendiaries and revolutionists? If this indictment of organized labor is true—and who can successfully deny it?—is not the existence of such a machine, whatever may be the justification for its presence, a serious menace to the industrial peace and economic progress of the country?

Maintain the necessity of such protection for labor if you will. As for this writer, he takes the stand on the American principles of co-operation and justice, and from that unshakable rock he charges that, not only labor and capital, but politicians, statesmen, churches and societies are manifesting the most dis-

gusting, saddening and unrighteous, cat-hauling, panhandling, bickering, bulldozing, double-crossing, fighting, known in our history. What a sight for men and devils! A nation created and carried by unity of purpose and action to undreamed of heights of prosperity and success, now a mass of industrial, political, religious, social and sectional intrigue, antagonism and confusion. "Whom the Gods would destroy they first make mad."

Are we such fools that we cannot solve our problems by the application of American principles, or must we have the statesmen of Europe, poor, sick Europe, direct our ship of state, while Lenine and Trotsky settle our labor trouble? Verily, we have the sense, and the fundamental national characteristics of fair play, unity and justice which, if faithfully applied, will make us trail-blazers for the world to the place of social and economic peace.

CHAPTER VIII.

The class war, sabotage, the strike and boycott are the ideas and weapons of syndicalism, in perfection of development and use, only. We have proved that the doctrine of separate class interests is at the very foundation of organized labor's existence. We have cited historical evidence proving that sabotage (destroying employers' property and working against his interests) have been practiced from the very beginning of modern industrialism. The general strike, boycott, closed shop, peaceful picketing, etc., remain for consideration.

Haywood, the most outspoken champion of the general strike in the United States, says there are "three distinct phases of the general strike:

"A general strike in an industry;

"A general strike in a community;

"A general national strike."

"The General Strike," Wm. D. Haywood, page 12.

A quotation from Vincent St. John may be illuminating in this connection: "The question of right and wrong does not concern us," said he, "the principal weapon is the strike, and when that fails to

force concessions from the employers, work is resumed and sabotage is used to force the employers to concede the demands of the workers."

The strike is likewise the chief weapon of organized labor. The majority of strikes called in this country have not been called by the wobblies. We are not saying that all strikes were without justification. We are saying, however, that the strike is one of the weapons of direct action. Now, the I. W. W. and conservative union labor will start in at a given point and fight each other all down the line, and then eventually arrive at the same place. "It is quite an interesting study," says a clever writer, "to observe how the most reactionary of old-fashioned labor unionists and syndicalists arrive at the same practical results. Believing in the sufficiency of trade unionism, relying completely upon the strike and the boycott, the old-fashioned unionist denies the need for political action. He points to the fact that certain trades enjoy the eight hour work day, for example, won by the union and not brought about by legislation. The Syndicalist takes the same attitude and defends it with the same argument. Thus extremes meet."

As long as the memory of the general strikes in Winnipeg and Seattle and the general coal and steel strikes endure, it will never be possible to say truth-

fully that organized labor and the I. W. W. do not argue as to the efficiency of the strike. Some will object that these unions were under radical leadership, but it is quite noticeable that the men who had most to do with these strikes are, so far as we know, still in good standing in their unions and the American Federation of Labor.

It is not for us to tire the reader with dry statistics and historical detail. We wish, however, to give one citation from history, on the general strike which is far enough back to escape the charge of modern Red influence.

The first great agitation for the general strike in the United States broke out in the Federation of Organized Trades and Labor Unions of this country and Canada—now known as the American Federation of Labor. This organization was formed in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 1881. In October, 1884, at the fourth annual convention of the Federation, it was decided to inaugurate a propaganda in favor of an eight-hour working day. A manifesto was issued calling upon all the unions to demand the eight-hour day and setting a day for calling a nation-wide strike in all industries to gain that end. The day first chosen was May 1st, 1885, but later it was decided to postpone the great event to the following year. The Anarchists took charge of the

agitation to carry on their propaganda and on May 5th, 1886, the Haymarket riots took place. It has been well said that "Rudolph Schnaubelts' bomb—if it was indeed his—was perhaps the worst blow which the working class movement of America had sustained up to that time."

Here we have then as fair an illustration of our contention as can be found. Conservative labor agitated the general strike, with no thought of direct action in the sense of violence and bomb, but the anarchists found things ready to hand and they carried the matter to its inevitable conclusion. Do union men deplore violent methods to secure their ends? To be sure. We have repeatedly maintained our belief in the patriotism of the great majority of America's toilers. We believe that many of them are far more patriotic than some of America's employers. But the personal attitude of Union men and the intemperate ideas and practices that their philosophy and machine leads them into, are two different things. Firearms are dangerous in the hands of the most careful men. The weapons of class war are equally as dangerous in the hands of the most conservative union men. The use of such weapons in the hands of the most careful is more than liable to end in the most disastrous fashion.

The boycott, the closed shop, peaceful picketing,

etc., have been carried to such extremes that any recital of detail would be unnecessarily harrowing and disgusting. We pass them by with as few words as possible.

The closed shop is positively and absolutely, and forever un-American, un-Canadian, and un-everything else which means freedom. It is one of the most effective weapons the radicals have ever found for enforcing their demands. It is a most flagrant violation of the rights of the employer and the employee. It destroys liberty, paralyzes ambition and stultifies production. It lays bare the breast of the general public to the most fatal thrusts from every weapon in the Red arsenal. It is as much a curse to the labor leader and the union man as to the public. More later.

Peaceful picketing, "there ain't no such animal," said a worker in our hearing, recently. He was right. How could there be unless by chance every free man died over night. Think you that an organization representing a small minority of American working men, an organization which refuses responsibility under the law, an organization built upon the backs of American toilers and led by men in horn-rimmed glasses, with fat salaries, comfortably ensconced in their magnificent seven-story office building in Washington, D. C., is going to control

the means of livelihood of free-born citizens? Think you, that free men of any land are going to permit representatives of organized labor to patrol with threatening mien before the bread, clothes and fuel of themselves and dependents and be told in the harsh growl of the labor picket, "Strike on here, stay away, enter at your peril." By the gods no. It must be stopped. Such methods do not make for peace. We are farther now from a solution of our troubles, after years of their use, than when we first began.

We haven't wilfully wounded the feelings of the reader. We know there are many who believe that organized labor is their only protection. Such contentions, however, are apart from the argument for the moment. We believe that the doctrines, tendencies and practices under discussion are absolutely destructive of co-operative principles and of peace. If we cannot find a better way out than the one used thus far, then more power to organized labor. Our interests are with the man who toils with his hands, but for all of that we consider them identical with the interests of the employer who toils with his brains and money.

We believe there is a better way out and that is the American way.

CHAPTER IX.

Peace in industry, and economic and social development along normal lines, are impossible while a sullen state of antagonism (breaking out at frequent intervals in strikes, lockouts and worse) continues to exist between employee and employer.

We have discussed the cause of unrest from the wage workers' standpoint. In this chapter we are going to ask what contribution employers have made to the present unfortunate condition.

Any man professing to apply American principles to the present situation who has nothing but criticism for wage earners, and praise and commendation for the employers is either a fool or a hypocrite. He is either ignorant of facts, or he seeks to curry favor with employers at the expense of the workers. Such an one merits nothing but contempt from all parties concerned. For, unless Democracy is a failure, there is a principle at stake in this controversy which must not be sacrificed, and which demands honest consideration and rigid application by, and to, all parties involved.

No matter what the present attitude of some em-

ployers may be, we charge them with having made in the past (and some are still guilty) their share of contribution to the present strife and turmoil in industry. Let us not attempt to dodge the issue. The subject must be faced squarely and settled on the American principle of the square deal, or be met in the future with no chance at settlement. Opportunity must be taken by the forelock, or disaster awaits us.

Some employers have departed from the great principles of justice, humanity and liberty upon which this Republic is founded.

First, they have been autocratic in their attitude toward employees, no fair-minded man will deny this. Certain industrial leaders have been more severely autocratic than others, some have had no autocratic intentions, but their representatives and their machine have been repressive and severe, while others are undoubtedly innocent. We are not dealing just now, however, with lily-fingered innocence.

This writer is a poor man. He lives in a humble little house. He knows what it means to tremble on the brink of complete failure. He has experienced the joys and the trials of working with his hands for a living, and for an opportunity to make

good. He has ambition, not for wealth or fame, but to contribute something for the good of his kind.

He is glad to acknowledge that his experience with employers has been pleasant. He thankfully admits that the firm upon whose list he now has the honor to stand as an employee—furloughed to carry on the work circumstances have thrust upon him—saved him from dismal defeat. But the consciousness of his humble position in life, nor his regard for the good, fair employers he knows are not going to prevent him telling the truth as he sees it. For humble position, nor fair treatment have not caused him to forget the history of Labor's struggle, nor paralyzed his faculties of observation.

Autocratic methods and attitudes have been used and assumed by certain types of employers. There is no country under the heavens in which industrial autocracy is more inexcusable than in America. A people enjoying political freedom are not going to take kindly to anything in their economic life which smacks of repression or tyranny.

The world is considerably troubled at present with a certain type of worker who has no respect for superiors and who despises authority. There can be no well-ordered condition of society where the whims and fallacies of such people generally ob-

tain. On the other hand, there are employers who have no respect and consideration for the brother of low degree. They are puffed up. Their vain imaginations have set them high above the "common herd." They forget that the red blood of humanity flows in the veins of the man of toil. They overlook the fact that the wage worker observes, thinks, suffers, weeps and laughs, and that he does other numberless things common to all. Such employers do not seem to recognize that we common folk have ambition, enjoy success, dread failure, that we love and hate, in a word that we are human beings. We are not beasts of burden, nor mere cogs in a machine. We have legitimate and worthy aspirations. We know who we are, and where we belong. We are members of "The Brotherhood of American Free-Men." The blood of our fathers paid for our life membership. Now, because money didn't buy our position, money is not going to take it away. We respect superior brains. We admire and honor achievement. We know the salutary effects of discipline. We acknowledge our superiors. But we are not slaves. Notice is hereby served on the lying agitators who call us "slaves," and the industrial autocrat who believes we are slaves, that there flows in our veins the blue blood of aristocracy, the aristocracy

of free-men: The choicest society of earth. Our pockets may be empty, our brains few and our social position low, but we are free! Free! Stand aside, ye autocrats in labor and capital, we want a chance to play the game. We are perfectly able to understand and shape our course without the guidance of the walking delegate or the czar in the boss's chair. The rich man in this country—employer or otherwise—has no station in life to which the poorest of our citizens may not aspire. In fact, the great industrial captains with hardly an exception, worked in their various lines from the lowest rung on the ladder to the place they hold today.

Any man favored with conspicuous talent, blessed with good "luck," possessed of means, and enjoying high social position, must never imagine himself a member of the upper caste. There is no such institution in this free nation. The rich man of today is oftimes the poor man of tomorrow. The employer of yesterday is the wage worker of today. We have seen in our brief day a bank president, a machinist's helper. A longshoreman in the president's chair of a great shipping corporation. An ex-convict the manager of a mighty business. And not long since a poor man suddenly realized on an investment he had scraped money together to pay

for on the installment plan. And we are well acquainted with an old-fashioned French lumberjack who is now a captain of the lumber industry.

Today you are a member of "The havegots," tomorrow you belong to the "havenots." You are a fool to be envious of the man who succeeds. You may, by application and thrift succeed tomorrow. On the other hand, a successful man, now an employer is a bigger fool to despise and set at naught his brother of more humble attainment. And of all the fools, the emptiest-headed fool is the "guy" who inherited all he owns from his forebears, and who looks upon the poor and struggling with contempt.

Thus read a few thoughts on fundamental Americanism which will give courage to the struggling, and take the strut and blow out of the one who has achieved.

Would it surprise the reader to be informed that there is a growing number of employers who have as little patience with industrial autocrats who would grind the face of toil, as they do with the labor autocrats who seek to run and ruin industry.

CHAPTER X.

Employers have not only been autocratic in the past but they have also been guilty of the exploitation of labor.

The revolutionary charge that America is governed by a capitalistic group with a powerful lobby at Washington, could be applied, with at least as much show of truth, to the labor group which supports a handsome seven-story office building and carries on one of the most powerful lobbies at the National Capital. Both of these groups have had great influence in shaping legislation. Take the Adamson Law, for instance: this was one of the greatest pieces of class legislation in the history of the American Congress. There are, in addition to the capitalistic and labor groups, other well organized and active lobbies at Washington. Outside of these, however, is the great unorganized mass of our citizens. These are the ones upon whose shoulders rest the final responsibilities of government. They number, at a minimum calculation, between sixty and seventy million people. They are not all voters, but their expressed opinion and vot-

ing strength is going to determine, more and more, the character of legislation enacted. They are becoming "Class Conscious" so to speak. They are realizing that Democracy means majority rule. They propose from now on to settle with Congress who gives vote and influence to group legislation. The charge then, of class rule in this country, means nothing more than our citizens are neglecting their duty. If the idea of class domination is accepted, we would like to know which class it is, labor or capital? There is much evidence to support the growing opinion that organized labor is trying to run the entire country in the interest of a special group. Rest assured this attempt is doomed to failure in the same way, and for the same reason, that similar attempts by other groups have failed.

But what about the exploitation of the wage worker by individual and organized employer? It has been done. Employers have been guilty of grinding the brow of toil. They have tried in the past to get all they could out of the wage worker and give as little as possible in return. Such men have made labor organization necessary for the protection of workers. The result, as we have pointed out before, is that two important elements of our population are arrayed against each other in combative organizations. There can be no lasting

industrial peace under such conditions. These organizations must cease to exist or apply themselves to projecting and accomplishing a scheme of co-operation founded upon liberty, understanding and honorable agreement. With the present attitude of Labor, which seems bent on going as far in the exploitation and domination of both capital and the worker, as ever the most autocratic employer has gone in the past, we have but little to expect in the direction of co-operation from such mutually destructive forces.

From the employers' side there is now a very marked willingness on the part of most of them to meet labor more than half way. As for those who still fondly dream of "the good old days" (?) they must be reminded that general contentment and satisfactory prosperity cannot obtain while one side is trying to rob the other. Denying the worker a just recompense for toil honestly delivered is robbery of the most devilish sort. Such injustice merits, and finally receives, the condemnation of all fair-minded men.

Does the reader believe there is a Supreme Being? Undoubtedly when he is alone and thinks the matter over seriously he admits, what multitudes of others have, that God is the final demand of consistent reasoning. Mankind distinctively looks for

the final dispensation of perfect justice from a higher source than himself. The history of the race is full of incidents which loudly proclaim that man is right in this belief, with its comfort or fear, depending upon the quality of his actions.

The Bible tells us about Jehovah, and his laws. Whether the book is inspired or not, is a question of no special interest for the moment. Inspiration is not necessary to truth. From another view point we might say "All Truth Is Inspired." This writer, however, subscribes his unworthy name to the creeds of Christendom, so far as the inspiration of the Scriptures is concerned. Let us not forget that the more we get back to old fashioned Americanism the closer we come to the Bible. A very slight acquaintance with the beginning of American history will reveal to anyone that Americanism was born of Scriptural inspiration.

There are many passages in the Old Book which deal with the relationships of rich and poor, employer and employee, government and citizenship. One of the most unusual of these passages is found in James 5:1-4. We pass this pasage on to the reader because we know of no book on Economics, Sociology or Humanitarianism which equals it for fullness of expression and pungent warning. We

attempt no interpretation of the passage, we leave that to the Master Expositor—Conscience.

1. "Go to now, ye rich men, weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you.

2. "Your riches are corrupted and your garments are moth eaten.

3. "Your gold and silver is cankered; and the rust of them shall be a witness against you, and shall eat your flesh as it were fire. Ye have heaped treasure together for the last days.

4. "Behold, the hire of the labourers who have reaped down your fields, which is kept back by fraud, crieth; and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth."

This is fine reading. It will undoubtedly be taken seriously by good Americans.

CHAPTER XI.

If industrial unrest is due to departure from, or positive failure to comply with, American principles in industry, we are pressed to ask why these departures and failures, on the part of both employer and employee, have occurred. Undoubtedly there are many contributary causes, but we are going to examine two or three which we consider the most important.

The reader's attention has been repeatedly directed to the thought that organizations of workers and bosses must be co-operative, instead of combative. At the present time they are not co-operative because they are formed and directed to protect interests, supposedly separate, but, according to all dictates of common sense and necessity, interests which are identical. The more one studies the deep underlying necessity for hearty and friendly co-operation between employer and employee, in furthering and establishing industry, the more amazed one becomes at the strange blindness which has affected the parties concerned and caused them to strike at each other, when they should be clasp-

ing hands in good fellowship and brotherly regard. Employers have used autocratic methods in dealing with labor, to a sufficient extent; and labor has used the weapons of direct action—strike and boycott—long enough to convince the public that both parties are un-American in their attitudes and are using weapons uneconomic, and therefore unable to bring permanent peace and satisfaction. A successful strike leaves employers with an ugly feeling. A defeated strike leaves the workers with resentment in their hearts and a determination to play even. This feeling is manifested from the workers' side by underproduction, and in various other ways. We shall have more to say of the futility of the strike in a later chapter.

What has brought us to this pass?

First and foremost, downright human selfishness listened for years to the rantings and ravings of those who would deify human nature, who strive to make us believe that humanity is an offspring of the gods. That our tempers and dispositions are positively angelic. All history testifies, however, to the fact that while there is much of nobility and beauty of spirit in the race—there is, at the same time, a deep trait of depraved selfishness in us all. The spirit of selfishness, covetousness and money lust has been the one great cause of all our

troubles. There are exciting causes but the predisposition to depraved self-interest and heedless avarice has poisoned the whole human family. Let the reader, whatever his station in life, apply this thought to himself, and then to the general situation, and see if the contention is not true. The thought needs no amplification. It is very generally accepted by real thinkers. The remedy is unselfishness. A humanitarian consideration for the interests of others.

Second: Modern industrial methods and machinery have furnished a very effective, exciting cause for unrest. Many an employer now realizes that modern methods have robber industrial relations of the human touch. When industry was small and the employer was in close personal touch with his workers, trouble was of less frequent occurrence and very easily settled. But, as industry developed and employers were forced to depend more and more upon subordinates for representation, the gulf between employer and employee widened. Many fair employers have been most woefully misrepresented by haughty, tyrannizing, inhuman superintendents and foremen.

In addition "As industry has become increasingly specialized, the workmen of today, instead of following the product through from start to finish,

and being stimulated by the feeling that he is the sole creator of a useful article, as was more or less the case in early days, now devotes his energies, for the most part, to countless repetitions of a single act or process, which is but one of perhaps a hundred operations necessary to transform the raw material into the finished product.

"The worker loses sight of the significance of the part he plays in industry and feels himself to be merely one of the many cogs in a wheel. All the more, therefore, is it necessary that he should have contact with men engaged in other processes, and fulfilling other functions in industry, that he may still realize he is a part, and a necessary, though it may be an inconspicuous part, of a great enterprise.

"In modern warfare those who man the large guns find the range, not by training the guns on the object which they are seeking to reach, but in obedience to a mechanical formulae, which is worked out for them. Stationed behind the hill or mound, they seldom see the object at which their deadly fire is directed. One can readily imagine the sense of detachment and ineffectiveness which must come over these men.

"But when the airplane, circling overhead, gets into communication with the gunner beneath and

describes the thing to be accomplished, and the effectiveness of the shot, a new meaning comes into his life. In a second, he has become a part of the great struggle. He knows that his efforts are counting, that he is helping to bring success to his comrades. There comes to him a new enthusiasm and interest in his work.

"The sense of isolation and detachment from the accomplishments of industry, which too often comes to the workers of today, can be overcome only by contact with the other contributing parties. Where such contact is not possible directly, it must be brought about indirectly through representation. In this way only can common purpose be kept alive, individual interest safe-guarded and the general welfare promoted.—From "Representation in Industry," by John D. Rockefeller, Jr.

Such conditions do not actually destroy the possibility of advancement for the worker. But they have, nevertheless, a deadening effect on his initiative and ambition. There never was a time in history when great leaders of industrial enterprise were looking more earnestly for capable, ambitious men for top positions, than today. And American workers need just now, more than any other one thing, that old fashioned American iron in their blood which will give them courage to take the

bull—of any kind of a job—by the horns, and fight their way up to better things. At the same time, in noticing exciting causes, we must recognize that modern methods in industry, necessary though they may be, have a tendency to crush the free expression of individual initiative and opinion. This condition is un-American. From the political standpoint, no matter how humble the station of the citizen in life, it is not only his privilege, but his duty to express himself. The same condition must obtain in industry if we would have peace. For let it ever be remembered that if employers cannot find a way to open avenues of expression for the humblest workers, then others will do it and such leadership may not be to the best interest of either side.

Third: We have a vast, unassimilated army of foreign workers. From these ranks spring most of our professional trouble makers, and ultra-radical leaders. We are not overlooking the fact that we have native born disturbers in our midst. They are paid to look after the interests (?) of the toilers, and the very psychology of their position demands an occasional strike to give full proof of their interest and activity. But the strange phrases, ideas, doctrines and practices, which we call ultra-radical, are in the main foreign in origin and spirit.

Our shameful neglect in the matter of Americanizing our foreign-born population, is just beginning to dawn upon us, and thank Heaven, to arouse us.

We have come to a pretty pass in America when a native born ex-service man returns to his own country and city, seeks employment and is told by some walking delegate, with a foreign twist on his tongue, and an alien glint in his eye, what this hero can and cannot do, in the matter of securing a job, and how much toll he will have to pay to this foreign high-binder for a chance to earn his daily bread. When we think of such conditions we would like to write just what we feel, but it would not be wise. We have only this to say—Americans cannot tolerate these conditions much longer. If we had our way, the employers and the labor autocrats, who have created such situations, would be consigned to climes warmer than the north temperate zone.

CHAPTER XII.

The discussion of the cause of unrest has been concentrated on the relationship of employer and employee. There is another phase of the question, however, outside this relationship, which demands attention in this, our final chapter on "The Cause."

The High Cost of Living. Undoubtedly the high cost of living is the apparent cause of much uneasiness in industrial relationship. It is a great mistake, however, to regard it as only a cause. The high cost of living is as much a result of industrial unrest as it is a cause. It is not very logical, perhaps, to consider a thing as cause and effect at one and the same time. On the other hand, there are certain reflex results of movements and conditions which plainly cause certain effects; and just as plainly again, these effects become causes. This continual process kept up, ever widens into a vicious circle of confusion.

As a youngster you have called into the ear of the surrounding woodland to hear the answering echo. As your call was echoed back, the echo, in turn, became the cause of another echo. Upon a

louder call, you had a perfect medley of echoes. You were the first cause, but, as the echoes increased, you had a whole series of causes and effects in operation. The unpleasant point in the application of this illustration to the question under discussion is: Who is the first cause of The High Cost of Living? The economic law of supply and demand has, like the devil, been made to answer for many things. It is to be feared, however, that its normal operations are frequently accentuated or retarded by artificial manipulation.

Who or what is the first cause of high living costs? The wage earner with his demands for higher pay, shorter hours, and restricted production, with its consequent shortening of supply, in the face of increased demand; or the profiteers who corner markets, speculate in the necessities of life—and, in various other ways manipulate things for their own selfish ends?

Both are to blame. But of the two, the most contemptible party to the dastardly business, is the profiteer. Many loyal working men are honestly perplexed. They secure a raise in pay, only to have living costs boosted higher than their raise warrants. They cannot understand it. Finally the radical comes along and explains to them: "Your form of government is at fault. You need I. W.

W.ism or Sovietism in this country. Your employer is a greasy necked exploiter. You need to overthrow the capitalistic class, etc.''

These agitators are either such fools or hypocrites that they do not know, or they will not admit, that employers are frequently as much confused and suffer as severely under the strain of high prices as the wage earner. But the sleek, tricky, snaky profiteer is perfectly aware of the game he is playing. He knows the Whys and Wherefores of every movement. He parades his patriotism and at the same time exploits his fellow countrymen. Of all the despicable traitors which crawl on the face of the earth, it is those who use their brains and money to filch from the pockets of the people exorbitant and extortionate prices for the things of life. These Shylocks will have their pound of flesh. It matters not if the body politic, social and economic, is left trembling, bleeding and on the verge of death by their process. It is a crying shame that America cannot be rid of them by the same process and in the same fashion as we rid ourselves of Comrade Emma and her pal, Berkman.

To leave our discussion here, however, is very unsound reasoning. It shows either a blindness to or an inexcusable disregard of facts. There is an-

other side to this question. There are conscious and unconscious labor profiteers. What a strange fool a man is who cannot see that higher pay, shorter hours, and striking on the job are bound to limit supply, which consequently, in the face of undiminished demand, automatically increases prices. The world right now is faced with an abnormal and unprecedented demand for the necessities of life. At the same time it is confronted with the menacing fact that wage workers are about 50% efficient. High wages and short hours would not be so serious if we were actually producing to the utmost of our ability. We are not doing this. No marvel that labor leaders are beginning to urge stimulation of production, as the one sure method of avoiding economic ruin. Work—good hard, efficient work—will save the situation and make way for future settlement of the world's perplexing problems.

There is still another phase to this question. The masses of this country have wilfully committed themselves to the COST OF HIGH LIVING. Why? The poor, downtrodden proletariat of America, the wage slaves—(as big Bill Haywood calls us)—the working stiffs—(as our radical saviors dub us)—are living like kings. We have one automobile, for every fifteen people in the United States. The pro-

duct of the Ford, Chevrolet, Oakland, Overland, and other moderate priced manufacturers is bought up six months in advance. Who is getting these cars? Surely not the "so-called" capitalistic class. No, the poor robbed American Peasants—(Farmers). And the class ridden, downtrodden slaves of industry.

The movie shows operate all over the country, from 11 a. m. to midnight. With the exception of a few early hours of the day they are packed with enthusiastic fans. Who is paying a million a year to Charley Chaplin and Mary Pickford, and the rest of the stars and the—near-stars? Whose money is buying the great pipe organs and building the fine show houses? Surely not the capitalistic class. They haven't sufficient numbers, according to our radical friends, to fill the theaters. Who then, we ask? The masses. The great common rank and file of American citizens. Including America's robbed and poverty stricken farmers; and America's down trodden wage slaves.

The product of the Kimberly diamond mines for the year 1920 has been purchased for the citizens of this country. The significant report accompanying this is that the rich are not buying many diamonds just now. We are the best housed, the best fed, the best clothed and the most amused people on the earth. Still we kick. We pay high

prices because we are the most extravagant people in existence. We do violence to every law of economy and thrift and find ourselves in 15 or 20 years "broke." Then many join the red flag waggers, and advocate a mass hold-up of the people who have been wise enough to save, scrimp and secure financial security.

We must remember that the great private fortunes of this country were started by loyal adherence to the law of economy and thrift. Laws which the humblest may know and use. Reader, if you still insist on placing the cart of outgo before the horse of income, you need not be surprised if you find cart, horse and driver in the ditch of financial distress. Then we expect you will arise and curse our form of government, the employers and everything else in general, rather than your own peanut brain boneheadedness.

Let us try a strike on buying. Let us confine ourselves for a while to mere necessities. Let us go without some of the things we want. Prices will begin to tumble. The profiteers will be caught in a jack pot and we will show our good American sense.

CHAPTER XIII.

In seeking for a cure of industrial unrest we must first of all examine the methods or weapons used by men to adjust the differences existing between employers and employees. Then we must examine briefly the doctrines propounded and preached by the Utopian dreamers who have been telling us for many years that they were offering the one and only sure cure for the world's economic ills. These preachers of socialism of various brands are great disturbers of the peace. No system of government would suit them. They are preachers of class, clash and crash. More later.

The methods and weapons used to secure better economic conditions may all be passed without consideration with one exception—the strike. We have been anticipating in preceding chapters the cure of industrial unrest, and have, because of this, dealt sufficiently with the boycott, sabotage, etc. The strike, however, is so old and has been used to such an extent from the very beginning of labor struggles, that its success as a weapon, or method, of securing economic adjustment of a peaceful and durable na-

ture may be very accurately gauged. The strike, therefore, demands special attention.

Much confusion of thought exists as to the nature and purpose of the strike. First, the strike is a weapon of direct action. Many people connect the phrase "direct action" with violence—riots, bombs anarchy, etc. This is a very narrow and erroneous idea. When men will not employ the ordinary methods of political and legal action to secure adjustments, but will resort to other means, whether violance accompanies their use or not, they may be said to employ the weapons of direct action. The strike is an economical weapon. There have been many strikes without violence. Peaceful, loyal citizens have struck. This weapon, or method used, to enforce the demands of the workers, no matter how just those demands, is one of direct action nevertheless. Second, it is significant that every great revolutionist has believed and taught that the purpose of the strike was the overthrow of what is termed the capitalistic system—meaning, of course, by that the present order of society. The strike, especially the general strike, is the supreme effort of social revolution. If violence and bloodshed accompany it, that is merely an incident. We are not saying that all men who have struck for better conditions in the past have been bent upon revolution. We are only

calling attention to the purpose of the strike as interpreted by revolutionists of all classes. Every strike, no matter how small, carries within itself the seeds of revolution. Antagonism and bitterness are at the bottom of it. It engenders strife and more strife.

The strike as a weapon or method of securing industrial peace and justice is an absolute and disgusting failure. Some surface benefits have been secured by labor, but at such a tremendous cost in money, lives and human fellowship that the results secured when compared with the price paid by both employer and employee convict both sides before the bar of common sense with criminal foolishness and down-right disregard of public interests. Who can calculate the bitter hatreds which have been engendered by strikes. How can we measure the priceless values of American brotherhood which have been ruined for all time by this insane method. Money losses are not to be considered in comparison with the ruination of humanitarian impulses and co-operative fellowship, resulting from the strikes which have marred the past years of America's industrial life.

Let us take a page from labor's history and try to calculate what the loss in terms of co-operation and good fellowship means. We are going far

enough back to escape the oft repeated excuse that radicals caused the trouble. Radicals on one or both sides have undoubtedly caused all strikes, but there are many people today who seem to think that labor warfare is of recent occurrence and is due entirely to the influence of present day radicalism. Let us read from the pen of one of labor's friends.

"In July, 1892, a most serious difficulty arose in Homestead, Pennsylvania, between the Carnegie Steel Company and its employes at the Homestead works. This difficulty grew out of one in the previous month in regard to wages. No agreement could be reached, and the company closed its works on the 30th day of June, and dicharged its men. It is interesting to know that only a small portion of the men were affected by the proposed adjustment of wages. Most of them, however, were members of the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers; hence the trouble.

The company had refused to recognize the Amalgamated as an organization or to hold any conferences with its committees; it was proposed to operate the works with non-union men. The union men refused to accept the reduced rate of wages and agreed that they would resist the company in its attempts, whatever they were, to prosecute its work with non-union men. The lodges of the Amalgamat-

ed Association organized an advisory committee, with authority to take full charge of the affairs of the strike. All employes of the company were ordered to break their contracts and to refuse to work until the Amalgamated Association was recognized and its proposed conditions adopted.

The working men had already resorted to one of their familiar methods—that of hanging the president of the company in effigy.

Two days prior to the time provided by the contract under which the men were working the works were shut down, and on the Fourth of July the company asked the sheriff of the county to protect the works while they carried out their intention of making repairs, as they declared. The employes, however, organized to defend the works against what they called encroachments, or demands to enter; that is, they would not allow any one to enter on the pretense of repairing the works. As a matter of fact the employes of the great Homestead steel works took possession of them. When the sheriff's men came near, the employes, who were assembled in force, notified them brusquely to leave the place, stating that they did not intend to create any disorder and that they would not allow any damage to be done to the property of the company. They also offered to act as deputies in preserving order,

but this offer was declined. The advisory committee dissolved and the records of that committee were destroyed.

The immediate occasion of the fighting which took place later on at Homestead was the approach of a body of Pinkerton detectives, who were gathered in two barges on the Ohio river, some distance below the works. To make a long story short, the workmen entrenched themselves behind steel billets and prepared to resist the approach of the Pinkerton barges and all attempts to land, the result being a fierce battle brought on by the heavy volley of shots fired by the strikers. The Pinkertons were armed with Winchester rifles, but they were obliged to land and ascend the embankment single file, and so were soon driven back to their boats, many of their men being killed or wounded by the fire of the entrenched strikers. Many attempts to land failed, the detectives being subjected constantly to a galling fire.

This opening battle, which took place on the 5th of July, about four o'clock in the morning, was continued during the day and renewed the following day; a ten-pound brass cannon having been secured by the strikers and planted so as to command the barges moored at the banks of the river. Then another force of a thousand men took up a position

on the opposite side of the river, where they protected themselves by a cannon which they had obtained, and by a breastwork of railroad ties.

In mid-forenoon the bombardment commenced, the cannon were turned on the boats and the firing kept up for several hours; but the boats were protected by heavy steel plates inside, so efforts were made to fire them. Oil was sprayed on the docks and sides of the boats, while many barrels of oil were emptied into the river above the mooring place of the boats, the object being to set fire to it and allow it to float against them. The Pinkertons, under these warlike preparations and actions, finally threw out a flag of truce, which unfortunately was not recognized by the strikers. The officers of the association then interfered and the surrender of the Pinkertons was arranged. Under the armistice the detectives were to be safely guarded on condition that they left their arms and ammunition, and having no other alternative, they accepted the terms. Seven had been killed and twenty or thirty wounded, and on their march through the streets they were treated with abuse. Eleven workmen and spectators were killed in the fights which ensued.

On the 10th the governor sent the entire force of the militia of the commonwealth to Homestead and on the 12th the town was placed under martial law,

and order was restored. "The Battles of Labor," Wright, from page 128 to 133.

Here are all the attitudes, phrases, actions and weapons of actual warfare. Both sides, engaged in a Civil war like this are from the standpoint of Americanism absolutely without excuse. By what standards we ask again are we to fix the values of good fellowship and brotherly co-operation lost in such an affair as this? It is generally admitted that the Golden Rule is the true basis of human relationships. Where does it appear in this bit of bloody labor history? And pray where does Americanism operate in a shameful incident like this?

From a mere financial standpoint the strike has been as costly as it has been useless. The following table of estimated strike costs in the United States for the year 1919 will give the reader some faint idea of the criminal extravagance of this method of settling industrial trouble.

WHAT STRIKES COST U. S. IN 1919

Labor's loss in wages	$ 723,478,300
Capital's loss in productivity	1,266,357,450
Total for Capital and Labor	$1,989,835,750

The Biggest Losses Estimated by States

New York—		
Labor loss	$100,000,000	
Capital loss	300,000,000	
		$400,000,000
Pennsylvania—		
Labor loss	110,000,000	
Capital loss	213,000,000	
		323,000,000
Ohio—		
Labor loss	40,000,000	
Capital loss	110,000,000	
		140,000,000
Illinois—		
Labor loss	90,000,000	
Capital loss	175,000,000	
		265,000,000
Indiana—		
Labor loss	65,000,000	
Capital loss	100,000,000	
		165,000,000
West Virginia—		
Labor loss	60,000,000	
Capital loss	110,000,000	
		170,000,000

Washington—		
Labor loss	90,000,000	
Capital loss	125,000,000	
		215,000,000

Some idea of what these figures mean may be obtained by going back a few years and studying the cost of strikes in five states, Massachusetts, New York, Ohio, Illinois and Pennsylvania, covering a period of 20 years from January 1, 1881 to December 31, 1900. This, remember, was before so-called modern radicalism took a leading part in labor difficulties. The total loss resulting from industrial disturbances during these twenty years amounts to $500,000,000. Five Hundred Million dollars would make a silver path 12 inches wide, 1,479 miles long --or at the present high cost of construction and labor it would build 90,909 6-room thoroughly modern homes; these would house, five people to the home, 454,545 people. In other words this $500,000,000 would have bought and paid for modern homes enough to have housed better than the entire population of the city of Seattle. Or this $500,000,000 would build a solid silver shaft 2 feet square, 11½ miles high, a stupendous monument to the utter stupidity of the workers who use the strike as a method or weapon to secure industrial justice.

CHAPTER XIV.

For years the socialist agitators of various kinds have been proclaiming on the street corners, in the union halls, and any other place that they could secure a hearing, that the economic, political and social millennium would dawn when class distinctions were abolished and the proletariat came to its own.

We have listened to all kinds of radical nonsense. It all starts at the same place and ends (to use the words of an energetic radical champion) "No one knows where." There is very little uniformity of opinion among red prophets. All of them, however, use Karl Marx as a starting point and quote his statements to prove their theories. This is very reasonable for Marx can be made to prove most anything from that the earth is flat and the sun do move, to the scientific doctrine that the milky way was caused by the man in the moon upsetting a huge bucket of milk.

We have yellow socialists (most of them are yellow), red socialists, left wingers, right wingers, and some buck hand wingers. We have the erudite scientific comrade who can stand on the soap box for

two hours and discuss the doctrine of evolution in all its various ramifications from the primitive protoplasm to the richest and most highly developed synthesis (the exploiting capitalist) which the eloquent and mighty orator was striving to knock off the biological tree with the jaw bone of an ass.

As we have listened to these marvelous outbursts of scientific vivid panning, we imagined Darwin turned over in his grave with envy and Karl Marx straightened up from shoveling coal, wiped the sweat from his brow and viewed with immense satisfaction this new champion of his theories, while Herbert Spencer spiritually scratched his spiritual head and propounded another syllogism which shot him another million leagues into the "no man's land" of agnosticis mwher aet least he could escape the windstorm. To be sure we have learned afterward that many of these scientific spellbinders never possessed sufficient sense and pep to pass a third grade examination, while many others of their number were entirely unacquainted with that commonplace but very honorable scientific process of applying their back to an honest day's work, thereby earning their bread by the sweat of their brow.

Then we have the Utopian dreamers with the pink eyes, with the white angelic skin caused by deep thought and association with the deeper in-

telligence of the future—or by lack of exercise. The dreamers who not only walk in their sleep, but who are given to lengthy, impractical somnambulistic orations.

Then we have the bold yellowish red, direct actionist, the long-haired, gorilla-featured prehistoric type of socialist, who scorns the spoutings of his scientific comrade and who is impatient with his dreaming brother. This is the real fire-eater type. The genuine, Simon-pure, consistent, highly developed socialist who is rapidly reverting to type, who seeks by bomb, torch and confusion to feel again the peculiar thrill inspired by beating tom-toms in the valley of the Ganges or the Congo, the real Bill Haywood type who longs to throw off the restraints of civilization, and get back into the trees where he can hang by his tail and throw cocoanuts at his hairy comrades.

These various brands of socialism are championed by the Lenines, Trotzkys, Haywoods and Townleys. They all start from a common source and are all tarred with the same stick; each wants a hand at running this old planet. There isn't time enough. It would take from the dawn of creation to the crack of doom to give even a small portion of 'em a chance at us. Then, too, the world is so very busy trying to advance and develop along good construct-

ive lines that it cannot take time off to watch these various experiments generally applied.

Father Time has, however, set out a little section of the earth and apparently turned it over to the radicals to try out their bit of stage play for the general edification and warning to the balance of mankind. We refer to poor, unfortunate Russia. There the followers of Karl Marx got the chance to try their hand. In Russia and from the pens of Russia's dictators we may learn the truth.

Are we going to exchange the democracies of the earth, imperfect as they are, for the class dictatorships of Marx, Engles, Lenine or Haywood? Does the worker have a better time, work less, receive more, and enjoy greater liberty under socialism? These and kindred questions will be answered in the next chapter.

CHAPTER XV.

Facts are stubborn things. They are pitiless and inexorable in their operations. Men have spent their life time in building up clever philosophies; systems of doctrine, argued and apparently irrefutable in conclusion, and have set them going on the tracks of human thought, only to have their systems demolished by running head on with some pitiless stubborn fact.

No matter how cleverly reasoned out, or how subtle in metaphysics a doctrine may be, if it cannot stand contact with facts, the only thing to be done is to clear the right-of-way of the twisted and wrecked system, board the train of truth, and ride into the next station of mental assurance.

The various phases of Socialism founded upon the teachings of Marx are, at the present time, in a head-on meet with facts that will not down. Russia has been a blessing to the world. When she emerges at last from her baptism of blood and fire, and takes her place among the world's democracies, she should be hailed as a contributor to human freedom. Marxism of every shade has been tried out in that un-

fortunate land, and the world need puzzle itself no longer as to how socialism will work in actual practice.

We are going to select a few items which have been held up to us for years as blessings to be secured under Socialism. We are going to examine these items in the light of Russia's experience as interpreted by no less a champion of radicalism than Lenine himself.

First. Socialism has promised cessation of war. Socialists have been strong pacifists, and have advocated the disarmament of this nation, not only in times of peace, but in times of war, when, to have followed their advice, would have meant the overthrow of our nation. They have opposed military action, and have thrown bombs into parades formed by patriotic citizens for the purpose of awakening interest in preparedness. But what do they do when they get into power.

Lenine will answer.

"To insert 'disarmament' into our program is equivalent to saying we are opposed to the use of arms. But such a statement would contain not a grain of Marxism, any more than would the equivalent statement, 'we are opposed to the use of force.' "

A suppressed class which has no desire to learn the use of arms, and to bear arms, deserves nothing

else than to be treated as slaves. We cannot, unless we wish to transform ourselves into mere bourgeoise pacifists, forget that we are living in a society based on classes, and that there is no escape from such a society, except by the class struggle and the overthrow of the power of the ruling class.

In every class society, whether it be based on slavery, serfdom, or, as at the present moment, on wage-labor, the class of oppressors is an armed class. Not only the standing army of the present day, but also the present-day popular militia—even in the most democratic bourgeoise republics, as in Switzerland—means an armament of the bourgeoise against the proletariat.

"How can you, in the face of this fact, ask the revolutionary Social Democracy to set up the 'demand' of 'disarmament?' To ask this is to renounce completely the standpoint of the class struggle, to give up the very thought of revolution. Our watchword must be: to arm the proletariat so that it may defeat, expropriate, and disarm the bourgeoise. This is the only possible policy of the revolutionary class, a policy arising directly from the actual evolution of capitalistic militarism, in fact, dictated by the evolution."—From "The Disarmament Cry," by N. Lenine, in the Class Struggle, May-June, 1918.

So much for the pacifism and the disarmament

which the socialists so loudly proclaim. It must never be forgotten that the Bolsheviki came into power in Russia by a military coup d'etat.

Second. Democracy under Socialism has been painted in glowing colors. We have been told that every man would be free and equal, and classes in society would be abolished. The facts, however, all go to prove that Democracy will perish from the face of the earth, when Socialism gains universal control.

Lenine has admitted with great frankness that "Just as one hundred and fifty thousand lordly land owners under Czarism dominated the one hundred and thirty millions of Russian peasants, so two hundred thousand members of the Bolshevik party are imposing their proletarian will on the mass, but this time in the interest of the latter."—From the New International, April 1918.

"It is a curious illustration of the superficial character of the Bolshevist mentality that a man so gifted intellectually as Lenine undoubtedly is, should advance in justification of his policy, a plea so repugnant to morality and intelligence, and that it should be quietly accepted by men and women calling themselves radical revolutionists. Some years ago a well-known American capitalist announced with great solemnity that he, and men like himself,

were the agents of Providence, charged with managing industry 'for the good of the people.' Naturally, his naive claim provoked the scornful laughter of every radical in the land. Yet, strange as it may seem, whenever I have pointed out to popular audiences that Lenine asserted the right of two hundred thousand proletarians to impose their rule upon Russia, always, without a single exception, some de fender of the Bolsheviki—generally a socialist or a member of the I. W. W. has entered the plea, 'Yes, but it is for the good of the people!'

"If the Bolsheviki had wanted to see the realization of the ideals of the Revolution, they would have found in the conditions existing immediately prior to their insurrection, a challenge, calling them to the service of the nation, in support of the Provisional Government and the Preliminary Parliament. They would have permitted nothing to imperil the success of the program that was so well advanced. As it was, determination to defeat that program, was their impelling motive. Not only did they fear and oppose political democracy: they were equally opposed to democracy in industry, to that democracy, in the economic life of the nation, which every Socialist movement in the world had at all times acknowledged to be its goal. As we shall see, they united to political dictatorship, industrial dic-

tatorship. They did not want democracy, but power. They did not want peace, even as they wanted power.''—By John Spargo.

Again Lenine says in the New International for April, 1918, ''The word 'democracy' cannot be scientifically applied to the Communist party. Since March, 1917, the word democracy is simply a shackle fastened upon the revolutionary nation and preventing it from establishing boldly, freely, and regardless of all obstacles a new form of power: the Council of Workmen's, Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies, harbinger of the abolition of every form of authority.''

So much for the Democracy of Marx, Lenine, Trotzky, Haywood and Co. We prefer the Democracy of Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, Abraham Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt.

CHAPTER XVI.

Having examined the pacifism and democracy of the radicals in actual practice, we are going to notice how they have fulfilled their promises to the toilers: First, in regards to equal wages for all workers; Secondly, in regards to shorter hours and less work.

First, on the promise to reduce salaries to the standard remuneration of the average workers, Lenine says, "Without the direction of specialists of different branches of knowledge, technique and experience, the transformation toward Socialism is impossible, for Socialism demands a conscious mass movement toward a higher productivity of labor in comparison with capitalism, and on the basis which had been attained by capitalism. In view of the considerable delay in accounting and control in general, although we have succeeded in defeating sabotage, we have not yet created an environment which would put at our disposal the bourgeoise specialists. Many sabotagers are coming into our service, but the best organizers and the biggest specialists can be used by the state either in the old bour-

geoise way (that is, for a higher salary), or in the new proletarian way (that is, by creating such an environment of universal accounting and control which would inevitably and naturally attract and gain the submission of specialists). We are forced now to make use of the old bourgeoise method, and agree to a very high remuneration for the services of the biggest of the bourgeoise specialists. All those who are acquainted with the facts understand this, but not all give sufficient thought to the significance of such a measure on the part of the proletarian state. It is clear that the measure is a compromise, that it is a defection from the principles of the Paris Commune and of any proletarian rule, which demand the reduction of salaries to the standard of remuneration of the average workers—principles which demand that 'career hunting' be fought by deeds, not words.

"Furthermore, it is clear that such a measure is not merely a halt in a certain part and to a certain degree of the offensive against capitalism (for capitalism is not a quantity of money, but a definite social relationship), but also a step backward by our Socialist Soviet state, which has from the very beginning proclaimed and carried on a policy of reducing high salaries to the standard wages of the average worker.

"The corrupting influence of high salaries is beyond question both on the Soviets and on the mass of the workers. The sooner we ourselves, workers and peasants, learn better labor discipline, and a higher technique of toil, making use of the bourgeoise specialists for this purpose, the sooner we will get rid of the need of paying tribute to these specialists."

Here is a frank admission that the industrial proletariat, so-called, when put to the test was unable "to take over industry." This is the very thing, however, that the I. W. W.'s have been trying to persuade America's workers to do from their very inception as an organization. The men who are managing industry in America today are with rare exceptions, from the ranks of the wage earners. They proved their capability, therefore they were promoted. The world is so constituted that it needs brains, skill and faithfulness, to manage its affairs. Individuals manifesting these qualifications very quickly forge ahead.

One question presses for answer in connection with Lenine's admission. If the specialists spoken of in the above quotation, receive larger salaries than the average remuneration, and they save some of this margin, will they not eventually become wealthy—potential capitalists? If they should what becomes of the Socialist revolution? It is blown to frag-

ments. In other words, here is a FACT which will not down, viz., superior service, merits superior reward and receives it even under the Bolsheviki. This will always be true. It is the natural and moral process.

Secondly, the radicals have been telling the workers that they will have to work but three to six hours a day, at an easy pace, under the beneficent reign of Lenine and Haywood. This is very pleasing to the natural man. Of course, it matters not that all wealth is founded upon toil. The hardest workers in field, shop and office are ordinarily the most successful. Jehovah said to Father Adam, at the very dawn of human history, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken, for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return."

Here we have a divinely announced FACT. It will stand long after the Red Flaggers have rotted in their graves, and their names have been forgotten among men. Lenine acknowledges as much when he says in "The Soviets at Work:"

"In every Socialist revolution, however, the main task of the proletariat, and of the poorest peasantry led by it, and hence, also, the Socialist revolution in Russia inaugurated by us on November 7, 1917, consists in the positive and constructive work of es-

tablishing an extremely complex and delicate net of newly organized relationships, covering the systematic production and distribution of products which are necessary for the existence of tens of millions of people. The successful realization of such a revolution depends on the original historical, creative work of the majority of the population, and first of all of the majority of the toilers. The victory of the Socialist revolution will not be assured, unless the proletariat and the poorest peasantry manifest sufficient consciousness, idealism, self-sacrifice, and persistence. With the creation of a new—the Soviet —type of state, offering to the oppressed toiling masses the opportunity to participate actively in the free construction of a new society, we have solved only a small part of the difficult task. The main difficulty is in the economic domain; to raise the productivity of labor, to establish strict and universal accounting and control of production and distribution, and actually to socialize production."

Again Lenine says: "The most conscious vanguard of the Russian proletariat has already turned to the problem of increasing labor discipline. For instance, the central committee of the Metallurgical Union and the Central Union of the Trades Unions have begun work on respective measures and drafts of decrees. This work should be supported and ad-

vanced by all means. We should immediately introduce piece work and try it out in practice. We should try out every scientific and progressive suggestion of the Taylor System; we should compare the earnings with the general total of production, or the exploitation results of railroad and water transportation, and so on.

"The Russian is a poor worker in comparison with the workers of the advanced nations, and this could not be otherwise under the regime of the Czar and other remnants of feudalism. The last word of capitalism in this respect, the Taylor System—as well as all progressive measures of capitalism—combine the refined cruelty of bourgeoise exploitation and a number of most valuable scientific attainments in the analysis of mechanical motions during work, in dismissing superfluous and useless motions, in determining the most correct methods of the work, the best system of accounting and control, etc. The Soviet Republic must adopt valuable and scientific and technical advance in this field. The possibility of Socialism will be determined by our success in combining the Soviet rule, and the Soviet organization of management, with the latest progressive measures of capitalism. We must introduce in Russia the study and the teaching of the Taylor System and its systematic trial and adapta-

tion. While working to increase the productivity of labor, we must at the same time take into account the peculiarities of the transition period from capitalism to Socialism, which requires, on one hand that we lay the foundation for the Socialist organization of emulation, and, on the other hand, require the use of compulsion, so that the slogan of dictatorship of the proletariat should not be weakened by the practice of a too mild proletarian government.

"The resolution of the last (Moscow) Congress of the Soviets advocates as the most important problem at present, the creation of 'efficient organization' and higher discipline. Such resolutions are now readily supported by everybody. But that their realization requires compulsion, and compulsion in the form of a dictatorship, is ordinarily not comprehended. And yet, it would be the greatest stupidity and the most absurd opportunism to suppose that the transition from Capitalism to Socialism is possible without compulsion and dictatorship. The Marxian theory has long ago criticized beyond misunderstanding this petty bourgeoise-democratic and anarchistic nonsense. And Russia of 1917-18 confirms in this respect the Marxian theory so clearly, palpably, and convincingly that only those who are hopelessly stupid or who have firmly determined to ignore the truth can still err in this respect. Either

a Kornilov dictatorship (if Kornilov be taken as Russian type of bourgeoise Cavaignac) or a dictatorship of the proletariat—no other alternative is possible.''

How is this Mr. American workingman? These are Comrade Lenine's own words. A very keen observer and able writer has well said, ''There is not a nation in the world with a working class movement of any strength where it would be possible to introduce the industrial servitude here described.''—John Spargo.

CHAPTER XVII.

In concluding our discussion of Socialism in practice, we wish to notice how these great champions of free speech protect the freedom of the press. We quote from their official organ, Pravda, July 5th, 1918.

"The press is a most dangerous weapon in the hands of our enemies. We will tear it from them, we will reduce it to impotence. It is the moment for us to prepare battle. We will be inflexible in our defense of the rights of the exploited. The struggle will be decisive. We are going to smite the journals with fines, to shut them up, to arrest the editors, and hold them as hostages."

If a statement like this was made by the proper authorities, against the radical press for their efforts to overthrow American Government, immediately a great howl would go up about interference with constitutional rights, the downtrodden proletariat, etc. And yet it is perfectly evident that these are the only kinds of methods the radicals believe in; therefore, they must respect the efforts of our offi-

cials to protect the priceless heritage of our liberty against their insidious propaganda.

A great deal has been said about our unjust and rigid application and enforcement of the law. We workers have been led to believe that when Socialism gained control, Law enforcement would be done away with and Mercy would smile on the poor unfortunate criminal. Let us see how the Bolsheviki do it. We quote from Izvestya for July 28, 1918:

"Two village robbers were condemned to death. All the people of Semenovskaia and the surrounding communes were invited to the ceremony. On July 6th, at midday, a great crowd of interested spectators arrived at the village of Loupia. The organizers of the execution gave to each of the bystanders the opportunity of flogging the condemned to obtain from them supplementary confessions. The number of blows was unlimited. Then a vote of the spectators was taken as to the method of execution. The majority was for hanging. In order that the spectacle could be easily seen, the spectators were arranged in three ranks—the first row sat down, the second rested on the knee, and the third stood up."

For your edification we are going to quote from Chapter 13 of Article 4 of the constitution of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic. This

quotation sets forth the qualification for voting in the following language:

"64. The right to vote and to be elected to the Soviets is enjoyed by the following citizens, irrespective of religion, nationality, domicile, etc., of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic, of both sexes, who shall have completed their eighteenth year by the day of election:

"(a) All who have acquired the means of living through labor that is productive and useful to society, and also persons engaged in housekeeping which enables the former to do productive work, i. e., laborers and employees of all classes who are employed in industry, trade, agriculture, etc.; and peasants and Cossacks agricultural laborers who employ no help for the purpose of making profits.

"(b) Soldiers of the army and navy of the Soviets.

"(c) Citizens of the two preceding categories who have to any degree lost their capacity to work.

Note 1—Local Soviets may, upon approval of the central power, lower the age standard mentioned herein.

"Note 2—Non-citizens mentioned in Paragraph 20 (Article 2, Chapter Five) have the right to vote.

"65. The following persons enjoy neither the right to vote nor the right to be voted for, even

though they belong to one of the categories enumerated above, namely:

"(a) Persons who employ hired labor in order to obtain from it an increase in profits.

"(b) Persons who have income without doing any work, such as interest from capital, receipts from property, etc.

"(c) Private merchants, trade and commercial brokers.

"(d) Monks and clergy of all denominations.

"(e) Employers and agents of the former police, the gendarme corps, and the Okhrana (Czar's secret service), also members of the former reigning dynasty.

"(f) Persons who have in legal form been declared demented or mentally deficient, and also persons under guardianship.

"(g) Persons who have been deprived by a Soviet of their rights of citizenship because of selfish or dishonorable offenses, for the period fixed by the sentence."

For purposes of comment on this marvelous instrument of Democracy (?) we cannot do better than to quote liberally from the pen of John Spargo.

"What the Bolshevik constitution would mean if practically applied to the American life of today can be briefly indicated. The following classes would

certainly be entitled to vote and to be elected to office:

"1. All wage-earners engaged in the production of goods and utilities regarded by some designated authority as 'productive and useful to society.'

"2. Teachers and educators engaged in the public service.

"3. All farmers owning and working their own farms without hired help of any kind.

"4. All wage-earners engaged in the public service as employees of the state, subdivisions of the state, or public service corporations—such as postal clerks, street-railway workers, electricians, and so on.

"5. Wives and others engaged in keeping the homes of the foregoing so as to enable them to work.

"6. The 'soldiers of the army and navy'—whether all officers are included is not clear from the document.

"Now let us see what classes would be as certainly excluded from the right to vote and to be voted for.

"1. Every merchant from the keeper of a corner grocery store to the owner of a great mercantile establishment.

"2. Every banker, every commission agent, every

broker, every insurance agent, every real-estate dealer.

"3. Every farmer who hires help of any kind—even a single 'hand.'

"4. Every petty contractor, garage-keeper, or other person employing hired help whatever including the professional writer who hires a stenographer, the doctor who hires a chauffeur, and the dentist who hires a mechanic assistant.

"5. Every clergyman and minister of the Gospel.

"6. Every person whose income is derived from inherited wealth or from invested earnings, including all who live upon annuities provided by gift or bequest."

"7. Every person engaged in housekeeping for persons included in any of the foregoing six categories—including the wives of such disqualified persons.

"There are many occupational groups whose civic status is not so easily defined. The worker engaged in making articles of luxury, enjoyed only by the privileged few, could hardly have a better claim to a vote than the housekeeper of a man whose income was derived from foreign investments, or than the chauffeur of a man whose income was derived from government bonds. All three represent, presumably, types of that parasitic labor which subjects those

engaged in it to disfranchisement. Apparently, though not certainly, then, the following would also be disfranchised.

"1. All lawyers except those engaged by the public authorities for public service.

"2. All teachers and educators other than those engaged in the public service.

"3. All bankers, managers of industries, commercial travelers, experts and accountants except those employed in the public service, or whose labor is judged by a competent tribunal to be necessary and useful.

"4. All editors, journalists, authors of books and plays, except as special provision might be provided for individuals.

"5. All persons engaged in occupations which a competent tribunal decided to classify as non-essential or non-productive.

"Any serious attempt to introduce such restrictions and limitations of the right of suffrage in America would provoke irresistible revolt. It would be justly and properly regarded as an attempt to arrest the forward march of the nation, and to turn its energies in a backward direction. It would be just as reactionary in the political world as it would be in the industrial world to revert back to hand-tool production; to substitute the ox-team for the

railway system, the hand-loom for the power-loom, the flail for the threshing machine, the sickle for the modern harvesting machine, the human courier for the electric telegraph.

"Yet we find a radical like Mr. Max Eastman giving his benediction and approval to precisely such a program in Russia as a substitute for universal suffrage. We find him quoting with apparent approval an article setting forth Lenine's plan, hardly disguised, to disfranchise every farmer who employs even a single hired helper.

"Lenine's position is quite clear. 'Only the proletariat or the poorest peasants (the semi-proletariat as they are called in our program), may undertake the steps toward Socialism that have become absolutely unavoidable and non-postponable—the peasants want to retain their small holdings and to arrive at some plane of equal distribution—So be it. No sensible Socialist will quarrel with a pauper peasant on this ground. If the lands are confiscated, so long as the proletarians rule in the great centers, and all political power is handed over to the proletariat, the rest will take care of itself.' Yet, in spite of Lenine's insistence that all political power be 'handed over to the proletariat,' in spite of a score of similar utterances which might be quoted, and, finally, in spite of the Soviet Constitution which so

obviously excluded from the right to vote a large part of the adult population, an American Bolshevist pamphleteer has the effrontery to insult the intelligence of his readers by the stupid and palpably false statement that 'even at the present time 95 per cent in Russia can vote, while in the United States only 65 per cent can vote.'

"Of course it is only as a temporary measure that this dictatorship of a class is to be maintained. It is designed only for the period of transition and adjustment. In time the adjustment will be made, all forms of social parasitism and economic exploitation will disappear, and then it will be both possible and natural to revert to democratic government. Too simple and naive to be trusted alone in a world so full of trickery and tricksters as ours, are they who find any assurance in this promise. They are surely among the most gullible of our humankind!

"Of course the answer to the claim is a very simple one: It is that no class gaining privilege and power ever surrenders it until it is compelled to do so. Every one who has read the pre-Marxian literature dealing with the dictatorship of the proletariat knows how insistent is the demand that the period of dictatorship must be prolonged as much as possible. Even Marx himself insisted, on one occasion at least, that it must be maintained as long as possible,

and in the letter of Johan von Miquel, already quoted, we find the same thought expressed in the same terms, 'as long as possible.' But even if we put aside these warnings of human experience and of recorded history, and persuade ourselves that in Russia we have a wholly new phenomenon, a class possessing powers of dictatorship animated by a burning passion to relinquish those powers as quickly as possible, is it not still evident that the social adjustments that must be made to reach the stage where, according to the Bolshevik standards, political democracy can be introduced, must, under the most favorable circumstances conceivable, take many, many years? Even Lenine admits that 'a sound solution of the problem of increasing the productivity of labor' (which lies at the very heart of the problem we are now discussing) 'requires at least (especially after a most distressing and destructive war) several years.'

"From the point of view of social democracy the basis of the Bolshevik state is reactionary and unsound. The true Socialist policy is that set forth by Wilhelm Liebknecht in the following words: "The political power which the Social Democracy aims at, and which it will win no matter what its enemies may do, has not for its object the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat but the suppres-

sion of the dictatorship of the bourgeoise.''—Bolshevism by John Spargo, pages 279-283.

It is unfortunate for the Socialists that they ever had the opportunity to put their doctrines into practice. It is, however, very fortunate for the rest of the world that it has had a chance to see what they would do when they had an opportunity. Their economic and industrial philosophy has met hard and stubborn facts. Let us clear the track of the tangled and twisted wreckage, and board the train of American Truth for the station of Industrial Peace.

CHAPTER XVIII.

One would think that a condition so intricate as Industrial Unrest, one so full of complex problems, having to do with the welfare of one hundred and ten million people, would require many chapters of discussion to propose a cure. Such would be the case if we had a new remedy to propose. We have not. The cure we are to set forth is simple. We defy any man or organization to produce a better one. It is an absolute cure. We are willing to stake our life on its effectiveness. It is old, so old, and yet it is American. It is applied Americanism. We propose it with no fear of successful contradiction. It is no Utopian dream. It is not a paper cure. It has never failed. It will not only cure America's industrial, social and political ills but will, if faithfully applied, heal the world. It will end strikes, boycotts and lockouts. It will put an end to injustice, strife and war. This cure does not await the movement of the mass for application. The individual may practice it with a peaceful assurance of success. The principles involved in the cure are

the inspiration of individualism and the cement of collectiveness.

Before announcing this cure let us go back into American history for a moment. What do we find to be the predominant mental characteristic of, for instance, the Pilgrim Fathers? Their love of liberty. What inspired that love of liberty? Their deep religious zeal and love of justice and truth as revealed in the character of God outlined in the Bible. Perhaps they were extremists in many things. They were, to be sure, radically religious. In endeavoring to get away from what we consider their fanaticism, have we not departed also from the essential and truthful things they believed and practiced? America would be far better off if she were full of religious radicals rather than to be as she is today, full of Red radicals and traitors. We are not pleading for denominationalism. We are not advocating any particular creed. We are not forced to accept the extreme and fanatical ideas of our fathers. We are, nevertheless, coming back to the essential things, which made them what they were, or we are going to wreck. The banks of the stream of time are literally strewn with the wreckage of great nations. Let us be warned in time.

As we study the life and temper of the men who gave this nation to the world we discover that Amer-

icanism is a spiritual attitude which inspires lofty idealism and produces just and humanitarian relationships. Democracy is Biblical. Democracy is the Spirit of God, and is in perfect accord with the teachings of Jesus. Jesus was the world's great champion of Democracy. He was finally murdered by a clique, a minority which sought to keep alive caste and was bent on dictatorship. The teachings of the Carpenter of Nazareth are the foundation and inspiration of democracy. The teachings of Jesus were also the inspiration and the guide of those original Americans who, "being dead, yet speak."

The Pilgrim Fathers existed in England and Holland as a church. They were, until they reached the New World, nothing more than a voluntary association, first for religious purposes and then for immigration. When they landed on these shores they knew civil government would be necessary. They met the demand in the spirit of their religious faith. Forty-one members of the original company formed themselves into a body politic and agreed to choose such officers, and make such laws as their circumstances might make necessary; and they promised submission and obedience to this rule of the whole. They styled themselves free men. Let us read the document these original Americans drew up and signed.

The compact was as follows: "In the name of God, amen. We, whose names are underwritten, the loyal subjects of our dread sovereign lord, King James, by the grace of God, of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, King, Defender of the Faith, etc., having undertaken, for the glory of God, and advancement of the Christian faith, and honor of our king and country, a voyage to plant the first colony in the northern parts of Virginia, do by these presents, solemnly and mutually, in the presence of God and of one another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil body politic, for our better ordering and preservation, and furtherance of the ends aforesaid; and by virtue hereof to enact, constitute, and frame such just and equal laws, ordinances, acts, constitutions, and offices from time to time as shall be thought most meet and convenient for the general good of the colony; unto which we promise all due submission and obedience. In witness whereof we have hereunder subscribed our names, at Cape Cod, the 11th of November, in the year of the reign of our sovereign lord, King James of England, France and Ireland, the eighteenth, and of Scotland the fifty-fourth, Anno Domini 1620."

The spirit of loyalty to God and country breathes in every word of this wonderful instrument. These early American free men had been persecuted and

driven from pillar to post by England's haughty ruler yet they ever strove to be loyal to the last. Our forefathers never broke faith with their Motherland until they were convinced beyond all peradventure that freedom would be lost by future fealty.

Compare these with some of our modern Americans (?) who are willing at a moment's notice to take up any kind of a foreign new fangled movement against our institutions. The revolutionist and radicals in our midst are, but with rare exceptions, combustible, erratic, irresponsible, unappreciative, fly-by-night fools.

Observe the faith and spirit manifested in this agreement. Our land may be cursed with unbelief, her churches may become deserted, the lip of gross materialism may curl in scorn at Christianity, but we can never escape the fact that this nation was given to the world by virtue of the faith of a few determined souls. They came here for the "advancement of the Christian Faith." They did not commit us to creed nor denomination. America stands for freedom of Conscience. Those first Americans did, however, lay the cornerstone of this nation deep in the conceptions of the Brotherhood of Man and the Fatherhood of God. These facts are as thoroughly established as the pillars of Hercules and as immutable as the granite sides of the everlasting hills. The

first Americans were inspired, guided and corrected by one great rule—"The Golden Rule." Despite their infirmities and their extreme notions the rule by which they sought to live and which made them great is the rule of Americanism and is the only program of life which will assure contentment and success.

It reads "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and prophets." Who can stand before this lofty standard of human actions and relationship and be unrepentant; and yet this is Democracy, this is Americanism. America is God's last great effort to idealize, democratize and spiritualize the world. The spirit of America is not the Spirit of Grab. We have hurried to get rich. We have apparently forgotten certain great principles, but what historian can place his finger on a spot in our national history where we have taken up arms, except in defense of human freedom and the highest ideals?

Viscount Bryce, the great English statesman, has well said, "To understand America you must understand the idealism of her people."

CHAPTER XIX

"Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets."—Jesus.

Here we have democracy, brotherhood, freedom and justice. This is Americanism. Does not America stand for these lofty principles? Is not our flag the emblem of these ideas? Are we afraid to apply them?

As a people we believe in individualism. We believe also in collectivism and in collective representation. Apply these doctrines to industry according to the Golden Rule and we have the "Cure of Industrial Unrest." We readily admit that perfection is not for human beings but honest effort to approximate perfection in our relationship one with the other means individual and national health, wealth and peace. This is true whether the idea is applied to our social, political or industrial life.

The Golden Rule is the protective, inspirational and corrective principle of individualism. It inspires individual effort, protects the successful and saves the weak from the power of the strong. We need

men and women in this great day of opportunity and crisis who can shake themselves out of the mass and make their way to victory. The great men of the land are individualists. Everything was set dead against them. Many of them were without natural qualifications but taking advantage of America's fundamental equality, the equality of opportunity, they worked themselves from poverty to wealth, from obscurity to fame. Our history is so full of examples that we hardly know how to select the best. We are not going to try. If a nation of such power, wealth, and opportunity can be brought into blooming life by a few sturdy souls, such as the Pilgrim Fathers, the Puritans and others, what better example do we need of the opportunities and spirit of America? In such an atmosphere a Lincoln rising from rail splitter to President, or a poor boy climbing from poverty to wealth, or a worker rising from laborer to manager is perfectly natural and merely an incident. Where is the old American hickory in the back bone and the iron in the blood which caused the founders of this great democracy to brave anything, suffer anywhere and conquer everywhere. Brother go find yourself. Never mind the mass. Laugh your difficulties in the face. Gird up the loins of your mind. The opportunities of this land are on touch. Talk yourself out of the paralyz-

ing nonsense of the Reds. Their doctrines will ruin you. Do not spoil your splendid powers by sitting by and grumbling while opportunity smiles in your face and others less able climb the hill of achievement, ahead of you.

They say opportunity comes but once. It is a lie. America is a land of second chances—yea more—but the last will come and go some day and you will be so busy finding fault that you will never know when it passes. Yes, the democracy of Jesus, of America demands individual push and effort. There is room enough in this great world for all. None need stoop to robbery or crookedness to succeed; such are un-American.

Apply the thought to the job in your shop. Are you a poor simpleton trembling at the word of the walking delegate, paying per capita tax to keep the labor leaders in fat and easy jobs, a member of a movement which may not be elastic and big enough to take advantage of the new day? They do not recognize your worth and value. You count one. Wake up! Nothing can stand before you. You cannot fail. Make the best of this day and task and prepare yourself for tomorrow. Be an American in pep, initiative and accomplishment. Do not be fool enough to imagine that anyone is as interested in

you as you, yourself. This is your day. Brace up and face the fight like a man.

Americanism stands also for collective bargaining. Why should workers be denied representation in industry? We are not advocating any particular system of shop organization. Most assuredly we do not believe that the American Federation of Labor has got any monopoly on the practice of collective bargaining. We are simply recommending that the principles of democracy, as we find them in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, be applied to industry.

The employers practice collective bargaining in the representation of their business. By what rule of justice do they deny this right to their employees if they desire it. The principle recognizes mutual rights; the willingness to come together and talk over the affairs of an industrial establishment; the desire not only to talk them over, but to adjust differences. Americanization in industry will keep alive the human touch and will give each toiler the feeling that he is part of the concern for which he works. Americanization in industry will mean industrial democracy and the humblest worker will have an opportunity to express his grievances. Some of the greatest industrial establishments in the United States have practiced industrial democracy for years

under one form or another of organization. They have been successful and have been free from strikes.

The workers in any institution should, if they so desire, have the right to organize and elect from their midst representatives who will have at all times their interests at heart. These representatives should be elected by the men and from the shop in which the men are at work. This is the American way. Can the reader imagine the state of California sending to New York for a man to be elected to the United States Senate to represent the interests of the citizens of California at the national Capitol? No! They elect a citizen of their own state who has lived in their midst and who knows their interests. So likewise Americanism in Industry means the workers shall have representatives elected from their own midst. Men who know the conditions under which they work and who have an interest in the industry by which they earn their daily bread.

IN CONCLUSION

We wish to address a few concluding words first to THE EMPLOYERS. We have purposely refrained from suggesting any particular system of shop organization looking toward industrial democracy. We

have consistently maintained that the Americanization of industry will do away with Industrial Unrest. Upon you rests the responsibility of applying the principles and spirit of Americanism to business. We believe in individualism, not only in the sense of human personality, but as applied to industrial units. Employers cannot solve this question by mass action anymore than the workers can. Each employer must settle his troubles in his own particular plant. Thus one by one will the problem of the entire country be solved. Will you stand up and tell the world that you have brains and ambition enough to launch and successfully manage the business end of a great industry and yet you are without sufficient gray matter and initiative to apply American principles to the management of men? You are the logical labor leader. Either you will organize for this task, (if organization is necessary) or outsiders will do the job for you and to the detriment of all concerned.

The spirit in which you face this question is after all the most important consideration. No system of organization can succeed unless the spirit of democracy and the square deal inspires your action.

Second. TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC. It is not easy to draw a line of demarcation between the employer, the worker, and the general public. The employer and employee are members of the public.

They suffer from their own intemperance though they cannot always see it. Nevertheless for purposes of loose thinking we may recognize a distinction between these elements. Employers represent about one and one-half per cent of our population. Organized labor about six per cent. The general public ninety-two and one-half (92½%) per cent. In other words employers number around one million six hundred and fifty thousand, organized labor embraces six million six hundred thousand (this is a generous figure). The public is about 101,750,000. Now this 101,750,000 have been permitting the 8,250,000 of employers and organized labor to run this country about as they pleased. What a good natured lot of "lubbers" we are! It is high time we awoke. Public opinion is a final court of sufficient jurisdiction and power to settle these warring elements, if they will not voluntarily settle their troubles on American principles.

We appeal to you to arouse yourself against the un-American Closed Shop. The Declaration of Independence announces the inalienable right of every citizen "to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." The Constitution of the country protects this right. Labor leaders have been guilty of sentencing men to ninety-nine years expulsion from their union for the most trivial offenses. If all the in-

dustrial life of America was under the autocracy of the Closed Shop these men, their wives and helpless children, would have been sentenced to starvation, murder or suicide. Are you going to stand quietly by and see even the humblest among us, deprived of life and liberty in this high handed fashion? The question is not debatable. No one is denying the right of any man to join any church, lodge or union he may desire. On the other hand no one is to be forced in this free land, on penalty of starvation or worse, into uniting with any lodge, church or union. To destroy this freedom of citizenship is slavery. You must face the task of compelling labor leaders and workers to realize that a man might better be a scab, than a traitor to the plainest and most fundamental rights of citizenship.

Third. TO EMPLOYEES. Possibly the writer has offended you. He has not done so maliciously. The greatest opportunity in our history to forge ahead as workers is smiling upon us and this writer does not take kindly to the high salaried labor autocrats who would hinder our progress and lead us to reaction and ruin. We know your heart. We know you think things you would not express before your fellows. This is your weakness. Assert your American manhood. You must have learned by now that our cause gains nothing by extreme and unjust

tactics. Do not submit to the Bossism of any labor dictator. Remember the vast majority of America's toilers are unorganized. Be more afraid of being a traitor than a scab. Be an American and success will crown your efforts.

(The End.)

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 033 261 173 2